

SLOVAKIA

VOL. VII

JUNE, 1957

NO. 2 (23)



IN THIS ISSUE:

C. I. A. DULLES AND THE BENES CZECHS

50 YEARS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

ANALYZING THE ANALYSTS: IS THE SOVIET UNION
DOOMED?

A BELATED REPORT

DR. JOSEPH TISO: CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT

CASTLES OF SLOVAKIA: ILAVA

KERNER'S "CZECHOSLOVAKIA": HISTORY OR
PROPAGANDA? (Cont'd.)

THE HISTORY OF SLOVAKIA: CHAPTER THREE

WHO SAID IT?: 9, 18, 64.

Edited and compiled by
PHILIP A. HROBAK

S L O V A K I A

Box 150

Middletown, Pa.

• • •

Published by

THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

GANSER LIBRARY
MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE
MILLERSVILLE, PA. 17551

SLOVAKIA is published periodically by the Slovak League of America, a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent.

The chief purpose of SLOVAKIA is to promote a better understanding and appreciation of the Slovak nation and its long struggle for freedom and independence.

As Americans, members of the Slovak League of America firmly believe that the Slovak nation, just as all nations, has an inherent and God-given right to freedom and independence. They are dedicated to the cause of the American way of life, Slovak freedom and world peace and are determined to oppose the plague of Communism and all other totalitarian political systems.

Subscription to Slovakia \$1.00 per year in the U. S. A. — \$2.00 elsewhere.

Send subscriptions to:

S L O V A K I A

Box 150

Middletown, Pa.

Printed in the U. S. A.

JEDNOTA PRESS

Middletown, Pa.

SLOVAKIA

Published quarterly by the Slovak League of America

VOL. VII

JUNE, 1957

NO. 2 (23)

C. I. A. DULLES AND THE BENEŠ CZECHS

Philip A. Hrobak

The House Committee on Un-American Activities prepared and released, in September, 1956, a two-volume symposium on the technique of Soviet cold-warfare which it called: "Soviet Total War — 'Historic Mission' of Violence and Deceit." Besides Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, more than 120 other prominent United States Government officials, military leaders, labor officials, business executives, educators, journalists, and political scientists contributed statements for the symposium.

The analysis of current Communist tactics submitted by Mr. Allen Dulles ("The Communist Attack Upon Parliamentary Government," Vol. II, pp. 423-430) is interesting, indeed, even though it only repeats what others already had said and written on so many other occasions and, in spots, betrays a certain tendency. This tendency is particularly noticeable in Dulles' reference to Czecho-Slovakia, with which I am quite familiar. How the Reds take over a country is a pet subject of the C. I. A. Director; he has talked about it on many occasions, and we read about one such occasion in June, 1956, shortly after Mr. Dulles, at a dinner of the University of Pennsylvania "Law Review," described the methods by which Communists can gain control of a country's parliament. His contribution to the symposium, published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is for the most part a repeat of that address.

Mr. Allen Dulles says that in the Soviet process of subverting the "free" governments of Hungary, Romania, Poland and Bulgaria, "the actual presence of Soviet forces on the spot played a decisive role," though he does not elaborate on how it came about that Soviet forces happened to

be **"on the spot,"** or just how **"free"** the governments of the countries mentioned were at the time.

In Czecho-Slovakia, however, according to Mr. Dulles, "some of the same effect was obtained by the presence, just across the border, of strong Soviet forces and by the fact that the Soviet had previously occupied Prague and many other important **Czech centers** and had been able, by their terrorist and infiltration methods, to gain a position of strength which far exceed the numerical representation in the population at large.

"In fact, they prepared the way for the coup before they evacuated their troops in 1945. Beginning in 1945, Moscow exercised heavy pressure **on the free Czech government** headed by President Beneš.

"Hoping to be able to work with the Kremlin and anxious to insure the quick withdrawal of Russian troops, Beneš went to Moscow in March of that year. He sought agreement on the forming of a coalition government acceptable to the Soviet, which would include some of the pro-Communist émigrés who had been collected in Moscow during the war and who flooded back to their home country to play roles **preassigned to them by the Kremlin.**"

It is significant that this is the same story which the Beneš Czechs (Czech socialists of all shades now organized in the so-called "Council of Free Czechoslovakia") tell us today, the story which did not exist until after the Reds took over all power in Czecho-Slovakia, that is, until after February 25, 1948. If Moscow exercised "heavy pressure" on what Mr. Dulles calls **"the free Czech government headed by president Beneš,"** why did Beneš and the members of his handpicked political entourage tell the world in 1945, and as late as the end of 1947, that there was no Iron Curtain in Czecho-Slovakia, that the Soviet Union was not intervening in the internal affairs of that hapless country? Furthermore, why did Laurence A. Steinhardt, U. S. Ambassador to Czecho-Slovakia, tell the American public that **"there is definitely no iron curtain in Czechoslovakia"** (The New York Times, 2-1-47)?

It is significant, too, that the C.I.A. Director seems to know nothing about what happened to Slovakia and its

people in 1945, when Beneš and his Moscow-formed "free Czech government" — supported by the Red Army — returned as "liberators"! And why did Mr. Dulles completely ignore the long record of collaboration of the once-resigned president of Czecho-Slovakia with the Soviet Union — a collaboration that went back to at least 1922? What about the Beneš-Soviet Treaty of December 12, 1943?

BENEŠ DID WORK WITH THE REDS

Beneš did not only "hope" to be able to work with the Kremlin, as Dulles states, but he actually did work with the men of the Kremlin for many years. How else could he have become president again after he resigned "voluntarily" — as he himself admitted — and Hácha was duly elected in his place by the Prague Parliament according to the Czecho-Slovak Constitution?

The fact is that Beneš already knew in London, as head of the so-called "Czecho-Slovak government-in-exile," the conditions under which he could return as "president" of the country which he had first cowardly abandoned to Hitler in 1938, and then formally to Stalin in 1943.

And what does Mr. Dulles mean by saying that "some" pro-Communist émigrés "flooded" back to their home country? **All of them, including Beneš and his hand-picked political entourage, "flooded" back only because all were pro-Soviet and pro-Communist, and all had agreed to play the roles "pre-assigned to them by the Kremlin," as Dulles tells it.**

"When the parliamentary government of President Beneš was actually reconstituted," Mr. Dulles continues, "the anti-Communist forces were badly divided among four or more parties. The Communist Party, as usual, presented a monolithic front."

But the fact is that no anti-Communist and anti-Socialist forces were allowed to organize in a political party by Beneš and his government. The national Front Government of the Beneš-Gottwald coalition was dominated by the Czech Nazis of Beneš (Czech National Socialists) and the Czech Communists headed by Gottwald, the former collaborating wholeheartedly with the latter to suppress and

liquidate all anti-Communist and anti-Socialist elements in the country.

The Beneš Czechs might be called **non-Communist** forces, but never **"anti-Communist."** The same applies to the so-called Slovak "democrats" — the Judas Slovaks headed by Dr. Joseph Lettrich — who collaborated so closely with the Communists and the Beneš Czechs.

The vast majority of the Slovak nation, however, which was not permitted to organize in a political party but was forced to join either the Communists or the Lettrich "democrats," was truly **anti-Communist** and not merely **non-Communist**.

"Under these conditions," Mr. Dulles continues, "the elections of 1946 gave the Communists 38 percent of the votes. Thus they became the largest single party, their leader Gottwald was named Prime Minister, and the **Communists were able to take over key ministries**, including Interior, Information and Finance, with a crypto-Communist in charge of Defense."

SLOVAKS VOTED ANTI-RED

Mr. Dulles, however, does not explain who gave the Communists the votes: the people of the Czech lands (Bohemia and Moravia), or the people of Slovakia? Of course, informed persons know that the votes of the Czech lands did — **and they gave more than 38 percent of the total number of votes to the Communists.**

In Slovakia the Communists were decisively beaten, getting less than 30 percent of the votes cast, despite the fact that thousands of patriotic Slovaks were not permitted to vote while some 200,000 Czech army and administrative personnel in Slovakia did vote.

And another thing, Mr. Allen Dulles states that as a result of the 1946 elections **"the Communists were able to take over key ministries"** in Czecho-Slovakia. Informed persons, including the Beneš Czechs themselves, however, know that the Czech Reds had already taken over "key ministries" in 1945, as agreed upon by Beneš and Stalin in Moscow.

Is it possible that the director of our Central Intelligence Agency did not know this, that even today he does

not understand the difference between a Slovak and a Czech? Or that the Reds, even though they were thoroughly trounced in Slovakia in the May, 1946, elections, **nevertheless retained all key positions** in that country, thanks to Beneš and his government and the weakness and cowardly behavior of Dr. Joseph Lettrich and his "democratic" lieutenants?

"During all this period," Mr. Dulles rambles on, "Stalin had cultivated President Beneš and lulled him into a feeling of security as to Moscow's intentions. Meanwhile the Communists were building up their control of the Czech military forces, the trade unions, and the internal security policy.

"Finally, one of Moscow's principal 'expeditors,' Valerian Zorin, now Soviet ambassador to Bonn, was sent to Prague, and the minority Communist Party seized power in February, 1948, without firing a shot."

Dr. Edward Beneš — frequently hailed as "the smartest statesman in Europe — the world's foremost democrat — Europe's wisest politician" and "brilliant diplomat" — the man who was supposed to know Stalin and Soviet Russia better than any man in Europe, the man who saw what the USSR did in Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and other countries, was, we are supposed to believe, **"lulled into a feeling of security as to Moscow's intentions by Stalin!**

The fact is that the Reds were in control of the key posts in Czecho-Slovakia before the elections of 1946; the latter made them more secure and, hence, more aggressive.

GAVE UP WITHOUT A SHOT

T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Beneš were largely responsible for the conduct of the Czechs in regard to the Soviet Union and materialistic Communism; Dr. Edward Beneš and his political clique had lulled the Czech people into a feeling of security as to Moscow's intentions. Even many Czechs admit this today.

The Czechs, who controlled government in Czech-Slovakia, promoted materialistic Socialism and the pro-Soviet policy of Beneš and, hence, Czecho-Slovakia could wind up only as she did: The Czechs did not fire a shot at Hitler

in 1938, and they gave up to the Communists without firing a shot in 1948.

C. L. Sulzberger's article in *The New York Times* of March 10, 1956, based on information received from Czechs in Prague, aptly described the Czechs: **The Czech people under T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Beneš, had been transformed into a nation of 'Schweiks' (clowns or buffoons). The Czechs never had to fight for anything, everything being handed to them on a platter, including Czecho-Slovakia, and hence, had no real sense of appreciation for freedom.**

"The principal Czech **anti-Communist** leaders," according to Dulles, "either escaped abroad, committed suicide, or were eliminated by arrest. Non-Communist parties were liquidated by the armed seizure of their headquarters and newspapers. A purge commission dealt with all so-called unreliable political leaders."

Who the "**principal anti-Communist leaders**" that escaped abroad were, Mr. Dulles does not say. It is generally known, however, that very few, if any, "**principal anti-Communist leaders** are able to escape from any Communist-controlled country.

Does Mr. Dulles mean the members of Dr. Beneš's political family, who escaped "**wholesale**" from Czecho-Slovakia in 1948 and today form the so-called "Council of Free Czecho-Slovakia" and are regarded as *The New York Times* stated, as a sort of "Czecho-Slovak government-in-exile" by official Washington, "reliable enough to exercise significant influence in and on various United States Government agencies (USIA, State Department, Army, C.I.C., C.I.A., etc.), and even on Congress and the White House?

If he does, he is dead wrong in applying the appellation "**principal Czech anti-Communist leaders**" to them. They promoted the pro-Soviet policy of Dr. Edward Beneš and collaborated with the Communists: some of them have frankly admitted this regretfully, most of them have not, and all of them would rather not be questioned about it.

We know that non-Communist, and particularly **anti-Communist**, parties are generally liquidated in every coun-

try in which Communists gain control. We know, too, that Reds sometimes purge Reds themselves: even in Czecho-Slovakia the Czech Reds liquidated or rendered useless leading Slovak Reds and then even purged their own ranks. Who liquidated the **anti-Communist and anti-Socialist** parties in Czecho-Slovakia? Beneš and his handpicked and Moscow-blessed government and, mind you, after — as Mr. Dulles puts it — **“the parliamentary government of President Beneš was actually reconstituted”** in 1945! The Beneš-Gottwald regime controlled everything in Czecho-Slovakia: political parties, the press, radio, army, etc. In the lands of the Czechs four political parties were permitted by the government to exist, while only two were allowed in Slovakia (later, just before the 1946 elections, two more were permitted to help the Reds). So, in Czecho-Slovakia, anti-Soviet and anti-Red elements and parties were liquidated by both the **“non-Communist”** and also **the “Communist”** parties which were allowed to organize by the Prague government of the Beneš-Gottwald coalition of 1945.

BENEŠ FORCED TO DO EVERYTHING

“President Beneš,” Mr. Dulles states categorically, **“was forced** to resign in June, 1948, and the Communists took over and ever since have maintained supreme control.”

Beneš, according to his apologists, C. I. A. Director Allen Dulles included, was always **“forced”** to do things: he was **forced** to give in to England and France and surrender to Hitler in Munich; he was **forced** to take on the presidency after he had resigned; he was **forced** to go to Moscow and sign a treaty, without a mandate from the Slovaks and the Czechs, whereby he formally sold out the peoples of Czecho-Slovakia to Stalin; he was **forced** to return to Czecho-Slovakia behind the Red Army after he had cowardly fled the country in 1938; he was **forced** to surrender the great Škoda Works to the Nazis and then to the Communists; he was **forced** to hoodwink President Roosevelt, convincing him that Stalin was **“a good old Joe”** and really a democrat at heart; he was **forced** to hang Dr. Joseph Tiso, president of the Slovak Republic (1939-1945), and to imprison and put to trial all his Czech and Slovak

political opponents, including President Hácha, whom he had congratulated after he was elected his successor; he was **forced** to eliminate all anti-Communist and anti-Socialist leaders in post-war Czecho-Slovakia; he was **forced** to decree the establishment of "people's courts" in Czecho-Slovakia; he was **forced** to nationalize just about everything, including ecclesiastical property; he was **forced** to dispossess and deport some 3,500,000 Germans and 500,000 Magyars; he was **forced** to accept the resignation of non-Communist ministers in February 1948; he was **forced** to consent to the creation of a Cabinet under full control of the Communist Party; he was **forced** to resign in June, 1948; and in September, 1948, he was **forced** to die!

In 1945, after the end of the war in Europe, the world press told us that Dr. Edward Beneš had the backing of all the people of Czecho-Slovakia and that on his return to that country he was joyously and wildly acclaimed by Slovaks and Czechs. And yet, we are supposed to believe that this man Beneš was **forced** to do practically everything during his political life, except possibly to promote socialism and friendship for the Soviet Union in his country!

C. I. A. DULLES IS BADLY INFORMED

Mr. Dulles concludes his commentary on Czecho-Slovakia with these obfuscated words of wisdom:

"There are many lessons to be learned from this historical precedent. When the Communists obtain an effective minority position in any parliamentary body, it is a sign of danger.

"If, in addition to that, they have important places in the government and, in particular, control of the ministries of defense and interior, then that danger is greatly augmented and the country in question is ripe for a Communist take-over."

The director of the C. I. A. undoubtedly could have done better, if he were better informed. **How did the Communists in Czecho-Slovakia obtain "an effective minority position" in the government or the Prague parliament?** How did they happen to be in "important places" and, in particular, in control of the Ministries of Defense and Interior?

Beneš we were told, had everything under control. The Communists, we know, could not obtain an "effective minority position" and control of any ministry in the wartime Slovak Republic, for example, because they were outlawed by the Slovak government under Dr. Joseph Tiso. Beneš, on the other hand, after his return to Czecho-Slovakia, stated unequivocally that he would not govern the state without the Communists. The world knows what happened — and at this late date, so should the head of our Central Intelligence Agency.

If Mr. Dulles is thoroughly informed on the subject, he could have pointed out the one lesson to be learned from Czecho-Slovakia, or rather from the conduct of the Beneš Czechs: **you cannot tolerate Communism, you cannot collaborate with Communists and expect to retain the blessings of freedom.**

It appears that what Mr. Allen W. Dulles said about Czecho-Slovakia was prepared by a Beneš apologist, probably a Beneš Czech of the so-called "Council of Free Czecho-Slovakia," and, possibly, by a Beneš Czech employed by him in the C. I. A. itself. The Beneš Czechs have prepared many speeches and briefs for men in the United States Government and its various agencies. And that probably explains why the American public is so misinformed on Czecho-Slovakia.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"Today, in vain are the followers of Beneš trying to justify their collaboration with the Bolsheviks and their crimes against humanity during 1945-1948 with the desperate claim that they did so because the USA wanted them to do it. That is not only a lie, but a coarse and base insult to the government and the nation of the USA. The freedom and law-abiding democratic American people hitherto had no idea of the terrible crimes the Bolsheviks with their collaborators had committed in our country. Only now is the American people slowly learning the truth, that terrible truth and making itself heard. It does not want criminals and the agents of Moscow in its country." — (J. Horný, BOHEMIA, Dec. 1952).

"FOR GOD AND NATION"

50 YEARS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA**PHILIP A. HROBAK**

After greater numbers of Slovaks had settled in the United States of America during the last quarter of the past century, Slovak newspapers, fraternal benefit societies, churches and schools soon came into being. The Slovaks took to American democracy like fish to water, enjoying fully every moment of their existence in their "new" homeland. In America they had the very thing that souls of men everywhere thirst for: freedom. The liberties and God-given rights so freely and thoroughly pursued and enjoyed in America electrified the minds and hearts of the Slovaks and inspired them to work for the freedom and independence of their own homeland, where natural rights had been denied their people for a thousand years. Of course, their interest in the "old" homeland was only natural.

Political persecution and economic suppression were the daily lot of the Slovaks under the Magyars of Hungary. It was evident that the Magyars, after their settlement with Vienna in 1867, were determined to liquidate the Slovaks as a national entity. The Matica Slovenská (Slovak Institute) was taken over by Budapest and its assets confiscated, students were thrown out of secondary schools, professors were fired or transferred to Magyar regions for their Slovak convictions, and Slovak intellectuals and professionals were deprived of the opportunity of making a livelihood in their own homeland. "Extra Hungariam non est vita" (outside Hungary there is no life), the Magyars used to say, but this applied only to them, while the Slovaks were forced to leave their homeland by the hundreds of thousands to keep their bodies and souls together.

The incident that fired the Slovaks both at home and in America to do something about the unfortunate lot of their homeland was the Černová Massacre of October 26, 1907. Černová was the birthplace of Andrew Hlinka, beloved priest and ardent patriot, who had been sentenced to

two years in jail in 1906 by the Magyars for his active opposition to Magyarization. The good Slovaks of Černová, in the meantime, having completed the building of their new church with funds collected by Hlinka, entreated the Ordinary of the diocese, Bishop Párvy, who had suspended Hlinka because of his political activity, to reinstate and allow 'our Father Hlinka' to perform the ceremonies of dedication. The bishop refused, appointing another priest for the task. The people resented this decision of the bishop. On October 26, 1907, the date of the dedication, the Slovaks of Černová blocked the priest's entrance to their new church; hard words led to turmoil; the Magyar gendarmes on hand for the occasion fired into the mass of the people.

When the smoke cleared nine were dead, three were dying, twelve were seriously and 80 less seriously injured. Before the night was over five more succumbed to their injuries: fourteen dead, fourteen martyrs of Magyar chauvinism. And numerous Slovaks were jailed as "instigators" of the Černová incident.

The Slovaks in America swung into action; mass meetings of protest organized by the Slovak clergy and Slovak newsmen followed; articles in Slovak and English flooded every Slovak center to spotlight the attention of the world on Magyar brutalities. Thousands of dollars were collected and sent to the homeland for the defense and support of patriotic Slovaks. Černová, above all else, undoubtedly motivated the Slovaks of America to join the Slovak League of America, to form a united front against Magyar tyranny.

It was on April 4, 1907, at the invitation of the Rev. Stephen Furdek of Cleveland, Ohio, that representatives of the Slovak Press in America met in Pittsburgh, Pa., to deliberate how they might best help their wretched brethren beneath the Tatras. All recognized the fact that the time was ripe to organize all Slovaks in America into one union for the defense of everything past Slovak generations had built and fought for in Slovakia. Adopting the slogan "For Our Slovak Heritage" (*Za tú našu Slovenčinu*), the meeting adopted a two-plank program: 1. To care for and support Slovak cultural and political life at home (in Slovakia); 2.

To care for and support Slovak cultural and political life in America. Furthermore, it was decided that a mass meeting of American Slovaks would be held at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 26, 1907.

Soon after the Pittsburgh meeting, all Slovak newspapers in America publicized the proposed mass rally in Cleveland, inviting all Slovaks interested in the righteous cause of the Slovak nation to attend the "Slovak Congress" on May 26, 1907. It was undersigned by representatives of all Slovak fraternal organizations and newspapers.

"The purpose of the Congress," the announcement said, "is to unite all Slovak organizations in systematic national work. . . . Our old country is turning to us, let us help it. We must present a united front."

Over 7000 of them, representing all Slovak societies and newspapers, fraternal benefit organizations and parishes, clergy and laity of various religious and political convictions, met in Cleveland, Ohio, where they more than filled the spacious Gray's Armory. On that day the Slovak League of America was founded to unite all Slovaks in America to fight for the inherent, God-given rights of the Slovak nation which was doomed to national extinction by the Magyars of Hungary. On that day Americans of Slovak descent resolved in the spirit of America that the nation they are descended from shall be free and independent of alien rule, that it shall be the master of its own household and work out its own destiny as an equal among nations. Under the leadership of the great and immortal Rev. Stephen Furddek, the founder and first president of the Slovak League of America, the League made America known to the Slovaks at home, and Slovakia and her people known to Americans. The seed of freedom and independence, which had taken a solid hold in the fertile soil of America, was now planted by Americans of Slovak descent in the land of their forefathers, Slovakia.

Throughout the past fifty years, the Slovak League of America has remained faithful to its mission. It united the Slovaks in America to work for a better America by becoming alert citizens and to work for the liberation of their brethren in Slovakia from hostile, alien domination. The

League has made America and the rest of the world aware of the fact that the Slovak nation does exist and demands recognition of and respect for its natural rights. But the Slovak League of America also inspired and gave strength to the Slovaks at home not to abandon the uneven struggle for freedom and independence. It was, in fact, the Slovak League of America that made it possible for the Slovak nation to liberate itself from Magyar tyranny.

The fatal shot that started the world conflagration and massacre in 1914 had not yet been fired in Sarajevo, when the Slovak League of America prepared a Memorandum addressed "to all just and truth-respecting nations," demanding complete autonomy for the Slovaks on the basis of the right of self-determination. After the Sarajevo incident, the Slovaks were faced with the question: We are through with the Magyars, but now with whom shall we join up to gain what is rightfully ours? With the Russians? The Czechs? The Poles? After due consideration, the Slovaks decided to go along with the Czechs. The decision was greatly influenced by the Slovak League of America. But it was only after T. G. Masaryk, first president and one of the founders of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, drafted and signed the Pittsburgh Agreement on May 30, 1918, that the Slovaks really joined with the Czechs to work for the establishment of a common political state. The Agreement guaranteed complete autonomy (states' rights) to Slovakia within the framework of Czecho-Slovakia, which was to be patterned after Switzerland and the United States.

Unfortunately, T. G. Masaryk failed to keep his word. Advised by Dr. Edward Beneš and other "progressive" chauvinistic Czech socialists, Masaryk repudiated the Pittsburgh Pact, calling it a "scrap of paper." The Slovaks, however, never let up in their clamor for the incorporation of the Pittsburgh Pact into the Constitution of the Czecho-Slovak Republic. But to no avail: the Masaryk-Beneš Czechs in Prague subornly refused to listen to reason. After twenty years of Czecho-Slovakia under Masaryk and Beneš, the Slovaks were ready to break with the Czechs. After twenty years of Masaryk-Beneš pro-Soviet and anti-Slovak policies, the Slovaks and Czechs were farther apart

than they ever had been. Dr. Edward Beneš pursued his ruinous policy to the very bitter end, refusing to recognize and respect the inherent right of the Slovak nation to have something to say about its own destiny. Within a week after accepting the Munich verdict, without consulting the parliament or the Slovak and Czech people, he simply resigned and later left the country.

The day following Beneš' resignation, the Prague Parliament belatedly and begrudgingly granted autonomy to Slovakia and later had the law incorporated into the Czecho-Slovak Constitution. Hitler and his Nazis started their mad race to destruction; there was no one to stop them at that time. And the Czechs, apparently regretting that they had granted autonomy to Slovakia, placed Slovakia under martial law on March 10, 1939, and occupied Slovakia. Hitler, of course, exploited the situation. Without mincing words, he told the Slovaks to proclaim their independence or else. Under the circumstances, the duly elected representatives of the Slovak people proclaimed the independence of Slovakia on March 14, 1939. The independent Republic of Slovakia was soon recognized by twenty-seven countries.

Slovakia was not too badly off during the war; as far as their internal affairs were concerned, the Slovaks managed their country well under President Joseph Tiso. They were better off than most neutral countries and enjoyed more freedom than they ever did under Masaryk and Beneš. Why Hitler left them alone and did not bother to take them over completely, as he did the Czechs and so many other nations, still remains unexplained. But the fact is that the Slovaks were doing right well until the end of August 1944, when Moscow agents and the Beneš pro-Soviet clique engineered the so-called "Slovak National Uprising." The story of Warsaw was repeated. Hitler's hordes poured into Slovakia "to restore order" — and the Slovaks were on the receiving end of both sides, the Reds and the Nazis. Over 70,000 Slovaks were killed in the slaughter.

We know what happened at the end of World War II. Beneš sold out Czecho-Slovakia to Hitler in 1938 without firing a shot; he repeated the performance in 1943 by for-

mally selling out the Slovaks and Czechs to Stalin with a treaty. Beneš' pro-Soviet policy paid off temporarily: with Stalin's blessing he became president of Czecho-Slovakia again, this time the head man of the new "people's" Republic. To show his gratefulness, Dr. Beneš and his Red-dominated Prague government immediately began to liquidate all anti-Communist and anti-Socialistic elements in the "new" Czecho-Slovakia. But finally Beneš himself was destroyed by the monster he had nurtured to prove again that Communism devours its own children!

The Slovak nation was consistently vilified and misrepresented by the nations which dominated and exploited it. As far as the Magyars and Czechs were concerned, there was no Slovak nation, there was no Slovak language. T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Beneš told the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 that the Slovaks were but a branch of the Czech nation and their language was but a dialect of the Czech. In old Hungary, the Magyars boasted that they were the "*natio hungarica*"; after 1918, the Czechs beat their chests that they were the "state-nation" — the "Czechoslovak" nation. The Magyars accused the Slovaks of being anti-State and pro-Slav; the Czechs under Masaryk and Beneš accused them of being anti-State and pro-Magyar. Both Magyars and Czechs agreed that the Slovaks were "separatists." And their propaganda in America blasted the Slovaks who worked for the liberation of their old homeland from alien domination. The Slovak League of America was the prime target of both the Magyars and the Czechs.

During the last war, the Slovak League of America was the main target of attack of Dr. Beneš' smear and vilification campaign. Dr. Beneš knew the right people in Washington, Paris, London, and Moscow. Americans of Slovak descent could not prevail on their own government to save the Republic of Slovakia for the West; official Washington, in 1945, brushed them off when they begged that Dr. Tiso and the members of the Slovak Government, who had surrendered to the American Army in Austria, be offered political asylum and not handed over to the vengeful Dr. Beneš; and two million Americans of Slovak descent

could not prevail on the President and the Government of the United States to request Beneš to spare Dr. Tiso from the gallows in 1947. And today, ten years later, we find that the Beneš Czechs still carry some weight in official Washington circles.

The Slovak League of America has lost several skirmishes and battles, but it still is carrying on the fight for the recognition of the natural rights of the Slovak nation. It is only natural that the League is vitally interested in this all-important question, because the existence of the Slovak people is at stake. Since the Slovak nation has not been given an opportunity to speak freely for itself and never had been actually free and independent to work out its own destiny, the Slovak League of America has taken upon itself the obligation of pleading for the realization of the fundamental rights of the Slovak people. As loyal Americans, we are firmly convinced that those rights are predicated on the elementary principle that all peoples are morally entitled to speak in the United Nations, there to defend their rights to survival and self-fulfillment. Liberty cannot be exercised by proxy, and the Slovak people, like all other nations on the earth, must have a voice in the determination of their own destiny.

Being American institutions, the Slovak League of America and the Slovak organizations affiliated with it are primarily interested in the welfare and security of the United States of America. They sincerely believe that it is in the highest interest of America and the rest of the free world that the Slovak nation be free and independent. Therefore, they cannot sit idly by while foreign political opportunists of the Beneš stripe, discredited and cursed by their own people, exploit and compromise the good name of America, while given the opportunity to use American tax dollars to prolong the fiction of a united "Czechoslovak" nation and to promote the political, pseudo-democratic conceptions of Masaryk and Beneš which led to the destruction of Czecho-Slovakia and the utter enslavement of the Slovak and Czech nations by the Communists. It is, the Slovaks believe, contrary to justice and morals to recognize and give moral and material aid to individuals and

organizations that seek the destruction of the Slovak nation by promoting the big lie of a "united Czechoslovak nation." The truth is that the Slovaks never were, nor do they wish to be Czechs; and, on the other hand, the Czechs never were, nor do they desire to be Slovaks.

Americans of Slovak descent, organized in the Slovak League of America, are loyal to America, because to them America is an ideal, a living symbol of freedom, tolerance, and justice. They seek no special favors for the nation they are descended from, but only recognition of and respect for the inherent, natural rights of the Slovak nation.

The Slovaks learned about freedom and democracy from America. They know that they can best secure and safeguard their national existence only if they manage their own household. America has no cause to deny the Slovaks their rights to freedom and independence; this the American people as a whole understand well, but it seems that people making up our Government do not. This undoubtedly is due to the influence of the Beneš Czechs who collaborated with the Reds and the Soviet Union until February 1948, when they suddenly became "democratic" exiles. As in the past, so in the future, the Slovak League must expend every effort to correct the situation. Administrations of the United States Government, no matter what their political beliefs, must be convinced that the righteous cause of the Slovak nation deserves the support of all Americans. Americans of Slovak descent, we trust, are not overly presumptuous in assuming that they merit at least the same measure of favor and trust from their Government as does the bankrupt, pro-Soviet political clique of the late Dr. Edward Beneš, which today is operating in America as the "Council of Free Czechoslovakia."

Rebuffed and humbled on so many occasions, the Slovak League continues stubbornly and courageously in the work of liberating the Slovaks from all foreign domination. The existence of the Slovak nation can never be secured unless the Slovaks are masters of their own destiny. The Slovaks must not be denied the right to organize their own state, an independent Slovak Republic. The Slovaks are not against a federation or confederation of European

states, but rather for it. But into such a federation they want to enter not as an appendage of the Czech nation, but as a nation no less sovereign than the rest of the nations of any such proposed European federation.

Today the Slovaks look to America for liberation and salvation more than they ever did; the Slovak nation needs encouragement and inspiration in this its darkest hour. After the great onslaught of World War II, the Slovaks were thrown to the Red wolves of the Kremlin and their stooges in Prague, and yet they have never let up in their fight against Communism. They fought against this scourge of humanity in and out of season for the past 100 years and are determined, with God's help, to keep fighting it until the Red plague is wiped off the face of the earth. The work of the Slovak League of America will never be finished until this happens and the Slovak nation at last takes its rightful place in the family of free nations, there to share the burdens and blessings of free men under God, all laboring toward one end: a just and lasting peace, based on the love of man for God and for his fellowman.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

"Prague, Budapest, Zagreb, Brno, Bratislava were as German as Linz or Innsbruck, so much so they had German names: Prague (for Praha), Ofen, Agram, Brünn, Pressburg. In Prague in 1815 there were 50,000 Germans **and only 15,000 Czechs**; even in 1848 respectable people spoke only German in the streets, and to ask the way in Czech would provoke an offensive reply. . . . The smaller towns remained German far longer, some, such as Brno, until the twentieth century. . . . The German character of the towns (in the Habsburg Monarchy) had little or nothing to do with race. . . . The enterprising son of a peasant, Czech, Roumanian, or Serb, who entered a town, learned a German art and spoke German to his fellow shopkeepers; his children despised their father's peasant dialect, and his grandchildren, safely arrived in state jobs, forgot that they had ever been anything but German and town-dwellers." — (A. J. P. Taylor, *THE HABSBURG MONARCHY*, London, 1948; pp. 24-25).

ANALYZING THE ANALYSTS:

IS THE SOVIET UNION DOOMED?**PHILIP A. HROBAK**

According to a number of Western "expert" analysts, correspondents, and "top" diplomats, there are many signs pointing to the **"fact"** that the Soviet Union is doomed. They say that many things have happened in the various satellite countries, even in the Soviet Union itself, which **definitely** are unmistakable signs of the failure of the Communists to convert their subjects to the doctrines of Marx and Engels and "to sell their ideas to their own youth." To the "experts" this means the eventual doom for the Communist empire," the collapse of the political system of Communism in the "foreseeable future." Such is the apparent conclusion of analyst Howard Handleman of the International News Service, whose series of articles, published early in January, 1957, I have taken the liberty to scrutinize.

Is the Soviet Union really doomed? The vast majority of the nations of the free world undoubtedly wish that it were; and the sooner the Communist political system collapses, the better — but, unfortunately, wishing alone will not make it so.

As long as Western political leaders, "expert" analysts and commentators, "top" diplomats and "distinguished" diplomatic correspondents follow the path which the Communists want anti-Communists to follow — the path of "peaceful coexistence," the support of "nationalist" or Titoist Communism which is supposed to be "different" than the Soviet "international" brand of Communism, while the Communists of all countries under the leadership of the men in the Kremlin are busy conquering the world — America and the rest of the free world are in mortal danger. Under the prevailing conditions, it is not the Soviet Union and the Communist political system that is doomed, but the democratic west and all free democratic political systems. Of course, the West still has time to meet the danger with

effective countermeasures, but it's later than most of us think.

Substituting wishful thinking and arbitrary theorizing, and completely ignoring the Communist "guide to action" which is necessary for the understanding of Communist policies, techniques and tactics, did not and will not contribute to the downfall of Communism. Neither will irresponsible vagaries of Western Titoists, who glorify and idolize Tito, Gomulka, and Kadar — the old stalwarts of international Communism, but now the proponents of "national" Communism — as champions of democracy. **To promote "national" Communism (Titoism), that is, a policy of helping a Communist regime, for the sake of a Communist conquest of the world, makes sense. To promote it for the sake of freedom, does not.**

Events behind the Iron Curtain — as noted by the EVENING NEWS (Harrisburg, Pa.), January 7, 1957, in its introduction to the first of a series of six articles by Howard Handleman, "distinguished diplomatic and foreign correspondent" — have indeed moved with swift and startling speed in recent months. However, whether the analysis or interpretation of these events by the "Chief European Correspondent of the International News Service" is reasonably correct is, in my mind, highly questionable, the views of the "West's top diplomats" and the "daily headlines" on the future of the Soviet Empire to the contrary notwithstanding.

After reading the articles carefully several times, I had been left with the impression that the Soviet Union really was in serious trouble and might be expected to fold up within the next five years even without any armed intervention by the West. Undoubtedly other readers of the paper had been similarly impressed. But thoroughly informed persons on the Soviet Union and Communist techniques and tactics know that this is only wishful thinking.

The analysis tendered by Mr. Handleman has, I am afraid, only added to the heaps of misinformation so generously propagated even by so-called "Western experts" on Communism and the Soviet Union. The men in the Kremlin thrive on confusion and chaos; they promote it assiduously,

though they prefer that the West does the promoting for them, wittingly or unwittingly, for the edification of satellites and potential satellites. Strangely enough, the West thus far has done a remarkable job in that respect, and Mr. Handleman's effort, in my opinion not the least of the contributions, was appreciated by the Kremlin goons.

According to Handleman: "The handwriting is on the wall for the Communist Empire. Western diplomatic authorities see it. They say the men in the Kremlin must see it."

Was this a warranted or unwarranted assumption? Even if it were warranted, can any "expert" or "Western diplomatic authority" tell us with certitude that the handwriting on the wall is seen and interpreted by the men in the Kremlin in the same light as it is by any Western experts or diplomats? Of course not!

The job of busting up the empire of Lenin and Stalin, we are told, will not be easy and may take time, but "Western experts" — whoever they are — "believe the Communist Empire will break up without a major war. They also believe, according to Handleman, that if the West can hold fast for another four or five years, "the Soviet rulers in the end will offer an acceptable formula for security in Europe and the world."

But, Mr. Handleman hedged, "it is also recognized that, although the present signs point to the dissolution of the power of the Soviet Empire, **the trend could be reversed.**" And, when it comes to the Soviet Union, there are always "**too many unpredictables,**" according to one highly placed diplomat, "but certainly from everything we know now, the most likely trend over the next few years is one in which the Kremlin leaders will be pushed towards **a realistic negotiation** by their own peoples."

History, however, tells us in no uncertain terms that any such "trend" not only could be, but always had been reversed in the past. It also tells us that, whenever the Kremlin leaders were "pushed" towards a realistic negotiation by their own peoples, the negotiation never actually benefitted the West and the peoples concerned, but only the Soviet Union and Communist regimes.

"Western diplomats," said Handleman, "bank heavily

on the common sense of the Russian leaders." One of the "best informed, who has served in the Soviet Union," said the Kremlin leaders might make war if things get worse, "but the best safeguard against war, perhaps, is that leaders in the Kremlin are pretty level headed: they do not want to commit suicide." So, if it does come to the worst, the Kremlin leaders, we are supposed to believe, will yield "what they must" to satellite pressure and, in the end, instead of busting out with atomic war, "it seems more likely they will make a realistic and acceptable offer to the West for a workable security system."

It is obvious that what Handleman referred to as the "best informed" diplomat does not necessarily mean that a diplomat so qualified is in fact too well informed on the Soviet or Communist business. It certainly is most unfortunate for the West that its diplomats bank so heavily on the "common sense" of the men in the Kremlin and consider them "pretty level headed," because Soviet leaders are not just ordinary men with "common sense." They are madmen. Hence, if it is in the Soviet interest, they will commit suicide, because they know that the slightest indication to refuse to make the supreme sacrifice at any time means a betrayal of that interest, and the penalty for betrayal is death. Communism always has and always will continue to devour its own children. The Kremlin leaders cannot ever be honestly interested in any "workable security system" with the West, because they are dedicated to the destruction of western civilization and all systems of government opposed to the Soviet system.

What did the West really gain by what recently transpired in Poland and Hungary? Let's be honest and face it: nothing but the scorn and curses of the terribly disappointed wretches — the "heroic fighters for freedom" as the West called them — who certainly expected a lot more than pious platitudes, sympathy, and resolutions of protest from the Western democracies which, they swear before God and all men, are in fact responsible for their brutal enslavement by the Soviet Union and its stooges.

On the other hand, what did Communism and/or the Soviet Union actually lose by what happened in those hap-

less, brutally tyrannized countries? Let us be equally honest and openly admit that the Soviet Union lost nothing. And judging by past history, the Reds even stand to gain more power and prestige!

Having assumed that the Soviet Empire is collapsing, Handleman continued to babble, saying that "the Soviet rulers have embarked on a monumental and desperate operation to salvage what they can of the power of their empire." But the odds "among Western diplomats" are that the operation will fail because the Kremlin moved too late.

In the light of reality, however, it is rather naive, if not downright silly, to assume that the Soviet Empire is collapsing and then to declare that the Soviet rulers, therefore, have embarked on a "monumental and desperate" operation to salvage the power, which they still held firmly in their hands, but which the West hopefully wished was actually threatened.

Once he was captivated by his assumption, the Chief European Correspondent of the INS looked for support of his thesis to the view taken by Secretary of State Dulles at the recent NATO conference: satellite unrest carries with it the danger of a general war, but it is still to be welcomed greatly as foreshadowing the collapse of the Soviet Empire or a fundamental change in its character; and the "desperation in the Kremlin is reflected in the various means it has used to salvage power."

Now, what were some of those various means? He told us that in Hungary "there were tanks and guns, and concession . . . Chou En-Lai of Red China was invited to Moscow for talks. . . . Radio Budapest broadcast Christmas hymns and carols for the first time in eight years. . . . In Poland there were concessions. . . . On Christmas Eve radio Warsaw broadcast a message by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski."

Concessions? If that's what the above might be called, yes, but only temporary. After devoting one installment to the "various means" the Kremlin used to "salvage" its power in the satellites, Handleman then told us in the next: **"The Kremlin leadership appears secure, however, within the Soviet Union and in the other satellites for the time**

being." Quite a let-down, indeed! But there is more; the situation may not be such as reported:

"The best diplomatic brains in Paris and other West European capitals decry what they call a tendency to **sensationalize** reports of unrest within the Soviet Union."

On the other hand, however, "there have been enough reports to **convince the experts** that satellite people no longer are sheep who accept whatever they are told." What the 'experts' mean by "whatever they are told," is anybody's guess. We know, however, that if satellite people do not keep in line with the regime that is totally subservient to the Kremlin, they may be slaughtered, as they were in Hungary. But then, if there is a tendency to "sensationalize" reports of unrest within the Soviet Union, what was there to prevent readers of Handleman's "analysis" from suspecting that possibly even the Hungarian reports were sensationalized? And what was the net result in Hungary and Poland? Were not those satellite peoples, in the end, "sheep" who had to accept whatever they were told by the Kremlin and its agents?

Youth revolts in Poland and Hungary, and other satellites, also forecast the doom of the Soviet Empire, according to Handleman, who based his conclusion on the views of Western "experts and diplomats." Even students of Moscow and Leningrad "suddenly" have begun to question and "to criticize the results of Communist rule — if not yet the very tenets of Communism." Accepting this behavior of the students as a "failure of the Communists to sell their ideas to their own youth," Western diplomats figure, according to Handleman, that this "alone means the eventual doom for the Communist Empire."

Handleman himself, however, had stated in a previous chapter that "there has been no confirmed report of basic criticism of the **system of Soviet rule**." And we know that it will take more than criticism to knock Communism out.

But does it? Youth generally is highly emotional, impatient, and fickle; it is easily swayed from one ideology to another, taking little account of principles. We read of student demonstrations in Slovakia, Ukrainia, Poland, Bohemia and Hungary against oppressions of Red regimes;

in some places these demonstrations resulted in violence. The net result usually was frustration: their own people would not support their "revolts" — and the West was unwilling to intervene, because that might have meant war. Youth wants war in the satellites, but the oldsters do not — and Western democracies do not, either. After a couple of setbacks, satellite youth tends to accept its fate with resignation, like the oldsters do. Of course, that is unfortunate, because in the end it means a stronger and more powerful Soviet Union.

Now, in Moscow itself, did the students really question the infallibility of the Red Party, as Handleman told us? Did they really criticize **"the results"** of Communist rule, or possibly just some of its methods and techniques? What percentage of the students of Moscow and Leningrad dared to question "the results" of Communist rule? I believe it is safe to say that no one knows not even the "experts." Furthermore, is it not possible that some of the students, who did the questioning and criticizing, were trained agents of the men in the Kremlin? Unless Western "experts and diplomats," ordinary and "distinguished" reporters, take these and similar questions into account in their reports and statements, I believe we have reason to suspect that they are not objective, but more or less superficial and tendentious.

In the last of the series of articles by Handleman in the EVENING NEWS, we read that "the American dream of a Russia strong, healthy and friendly goes way back." That may be so, but does that necessarily apply to our dream of the Soviet Union? Or does Russia and the Soviet Union mean one and the same thing to Western "expert" diplomats and correspondents?

George Kennan, former ambassador to the Soviet Union and "one of the two or three best American experts on the Soviet Union," according to Handleman, "forecast bluntly in 1951 that the satellites would win their independence." Of course, he did not forecast exactly from whom or what, or how and when that would happen, but, behold what the same Mr. Kennan said on May 3, 1956:

"What we must recognize today, in the case of the sa-

tellites, is that evil like good, produces its own vested interests. Where regimes of this nature have been in power for more than a decade, there can be no question of putting **Humpty Dumpty** (i.e., a relative condition of freedom) together again and restoring the status quo ante... there is a finality, for better or worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe.... Whether we like it or not, the gradual evolution of these Communist regimes to a position of greater independence and greater responsiveness to domestic opinion is the best we can hope for as the next phase of development in that area."

However, according to the SATURDAY EVENING POST of November 24, 1956, Mr. Kennan, "our No. 1 expert on the Soviet Union," knew right along that satellite rebellions were going to take place, and actually predicted, in 1945 that they would. Then he predicted still further uprisings because "the same fundamental forces are at work throughout the whole area." What these "fundamental forces" were, however, Mr. Kennan did not spell out.

On May 3, 1956, according to Mr. Kennan, there was a **"finality"** about Red regimes, but some seven months later he knew that there was no **"finality"** about those regimes at all. That, of course, brings us to the question: Did Mr. Kennan, "our No. 1 expert on the Soviet Union," have the vaguest idea of what he was talking about on May 3, 1956?

We remember Mr. Kennan as the promoter of the "containment" policy of our State Department. When the Soviet "de-Stalinization" campaign erupted last winter, the same Mr. Kennan wrote many articles and spoke many speeches to explain **"the meaning of the change."** The central idea in all of these manifestations of Kennan is the same: **"The Russians have changed"** since the death and renunciation of Stalin. That, of course, was exactly what the men of the Kremlin wanted the West to believe!

Then came the Hungarian massacre!

It is obvious that Handleman attempted to demonstrate, with the help of "the best diplomatic brains in Paris and other West European capitals": 1. that the **"normal logic"** of Communist leaders is precisely the same as that of a representative Western mind (his own and the "ex-

perts' " he relies upon); and, 2. that within the next "three, four or five years," with the United States making a strenuous effort **to stop Communism in its tracks by appealing to "common sense,"** the men in the Kremlin, Russians or whatever they are, will come around to the point of "offering a realistic and acceptable formula by which the two worlds of the cold war era can live together in peace and later in friendship."

This is muddled thinking and tragic nonsense. The thesis is built on false premises. Many of our policymakers and writers, rather than being guided by a correct picture of what is going on in Communist minds, have tended to interpret these minds in our own image. They know that all decent people would like to have the cold war ended and a lasting peace established. But they know, too, that peace can come about only by "understanding." The chief function of our policies, therefore, should be to overcome "misunderstanding" between America and the Soviet Union, with the U. S. appealing to **"common purposes"**!

This reasoning derives from the assumption that the Soviet system is basically a national political system devoted to the pursuits of reasonable social goals. But a closer, better look at that system reveals that it is no different basically than the Nazi system. Because the Nazi features were widely accepted as evidence of irrationality, we called the followers of Hitler "crazy, dangerous madmen." What then are the followers of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Co.?

It is well to remember that, by virtue of their belief in Marxist dogma, Communists live in a mental world that is essentially hostile to the mental world of the West. From the very beginning, Marxism-Leninism has conceived the relation between itself and the rest of the world as one of destruction. The program of the Reds never changes: they are dedicated to our destruction; they will destroy us, if we do not destroy them first. In Soviet foreign relations there is no intellectual or emotional basis for reasonableness, as non-Soviet countries understand it.

"Reasonable Communism" is a contradiction in terms. The Communist mind, as the record shows, has so defined its world that it shares neither truth nor logic nor moral-

ity with the rest of mankind. It is, therefore, senseless to talk about establishing peace with the Communists. Temporary truce, yes, if it suits the Soviet Union and the ultimate aim of Communism, but not peace. Peace, in the sense of international order based on a minimum of common values, is not possible with an adversary who rejects the very right of other societies to exist.

Furthermore, Communists tend to develop the psychological tendency to engage in self-contradictory actions. It is not easy for most Westerners, even many Western "experts and diplomats," to grasp that Communists manage to be for and against something at the same time. Handleman's articles, though he did not bring the thought out, have many evidences of this.

The Communists were for the Russian people, so they executed more than fifteen million Russians from 1917 to 1938; they were for the Ukrainians, so they starved over 20 million of them to death in one year when there was no war; they claimed they were for a strong, democratic, independent Poland and then proceeded to knock the tar out of them, butchering over 10,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest for good measure; Moscow supported the parties allied with the Reds in the French Popular Front and simultaneously sought to split and weaken them from within; the Kremlin worked for Hitler's destruction at Geneva and in the capitals of Western Europe, but it also conducted negotiations with Berlin aiming at increasing Nazi strength; Tito, a most valuable product of the Kremlin, fought the Germans in Yugoslavia and also used their help to fight his civil war; Slovak Reds were for an independent Slovak Republic, but at the same time they collaborated with the Czech Reds and Beneš Czechs to restore Czecho-Slovakia; Stalin helped Beneš and his Czech Nazis back into power in the "new" Czecho-Slovakia, while his stooge Gottwald was under orders to speed up the complete takeover of the power by the Reds; the Kremlin is for peace and order in the world, but at the same time is fomenting trouble just about everywhere. And Stalin recommended **democratic** tactics as the surest way to achieve Communist aims. Communist dialectics!

Handleman's articles gave the impression that the recent disturbances in Poland and Hungary had weakened the Soviet Empire ("Prophecy of Doom Heard by the Kremlin, Observer Believes" — "Red Rulers Face Desperation Drive to Save Empire"). But is it not a fact that the entire history of Communism is practically an uninterrupted sequence of bloody convulsions? And yet we know that the Communist world is stronger today than it ever was.

What is more, the record shows that factional feuds within the Communist Empire do not help the West and the enslaved peoples, but ultimately only strengthen Communism. The anti-Communists of Europe apparently have learned one lesson from history: **no totalitarian regime, once it was established, has ever broken down because of internal disruptions; a totalitarian regime collapses only when external powers intervene.**

In the face of the recent Hungarian slaughter, the "democratic" West now should be definitely convinced that even the most fantastic courage of a suppressed people cannot overthrow a determined totalitarian regime which always has the backing of the Kremlin. Of course, rebellions and convulsions within the Communist-dominated countries are exceptional opportunities for the West to thrust into the Red orbit, but, if the opportunity is wasted by a West enchanted by or petrified with pacifism, the inescapable result of such historic frustration is a further triumph of Communism.

In November 1917, one regiment could have stopped the Bolsheviks, led by non-Russians, in their tracks. A year later, perhaps a division of Allied troops would have knocked them out, but a small army would have been needed in 1920. The Red Empire was always mortally vulnerable to a determined attack by organized external forces, but as the years rolled by the required effort increased both in size and also in risk.

Today the men of the Kremlin are convinced that the West does not want war — that it prefers to fight with words. Handleman reported: "the chief of these problems, staggering problems for the United States, will be to prevent a third world war from erupting." In the last of his

series of six articles (Jan. 12, 1957), he added: "the threat of a major war being triggered in this way (by the satellites) ... was the reason Dulles had to make the painful announcement during the December meeting of NATO foreign ministers that **the U. S. would not be able to intervene to help any satellite revolt with arms.**"

That is what the poor wretches in the satellite countries did not want to hear, but that is precisely what the men of the Kremlin did want to hear: the Reds are now determined more than ever to intervene anywhere at any time in the interest of the Soviet Union, the homeland of all Communists, with impunity. The Kremlin can always take care of revolts in the satellite countries and at the same time start trouble for the West elsewhere — and its stooges in the satellites know that.

The men in the Kremlin and all Reds agree with Dulles on one point he made at the NATO meeting in December: Soviet rulers shall never give up their dream of world conquest voluntarily!

Freedom and Communism are irreconcilable. Coexistence is the complete denial of this fundamental fact of the present international situation. The Communist policy of "peaceful coexistence" is aimed at the moral, political, and military disarmament of the West. At present it is the main Communist vehicle to destroy the will of the free world to live and fight.

Ever since the first Communist seizure of power, the Communists have amply demonstrated that they meant business and used power with utter contempt for human lives, moral scruples, and democratic principles. Since the free world has 'coexisted' with Communism for some 39 years (one generation), Communism has grown from 200 to over 800 million people and now rules one-third of the globe. Another generation of such "coexistence" and ...?

The situation becomes all the more tragic and alarming when we recall that ten European countries were harnessed with Communist regimes by the Western democracies to appease the high-priests of Communism, the men of the Kremlin.

What America and the rest of the free world really

need right now is a large, stiff dose of "**Knowlandism**" for the brain to clear our thinking so that we might resolve: NO MORAL AND/OR MATERIAL AID FOR THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES!

• • •

A BELATED REPORT

By CHARLES MURIN, Ph.D., LL.D.

It seems to be inevitable during a war, when the stakes are high, that people reduce their thinking to two categories only: **my side** is identified with the good and moral purely and simply, **the enemy**, or the other side, is the embodiment pure of the principle of evil which is the root of all disorder in the world. It is understandable that this psychological attitude belongs to war, because one has to know what he is offering his life for. However, if this psychological factor seems to belong to the conditions required for the winning of a war, the same attitude is a disturbing factor when it enters among the considerations how to win the peace.

This is exactly what we experienced after World War II in regard to the organization of post-war Europe. Besides this, Slovak refugees, among many others, have experienced in their own personal destinies the drawbacks in the application of the above-mentioned psychological attitude to the period immediately following the war. It took about two years until an about face had been brought about, and the writer of these lines had the peculiar opportunity of being personally involved in both stages of mind; the one that is supposed to win the war, and the one which aims at winning the peace. It goes without saying that the latter was infinitely more in accordance with common sense and reason and with what can be called the moral principles in politics.

The psychological attitude of seeing only black and white becomes a real disaster when it is adopted by responsible statesmen and politicians. As a direct consequence, this attitude inevitably involves political and moral contradictions that do not fail to give, with an unerring

exactitude, the results of which are best illustrated by the present state of affairs in Europe. It is our intention to point out one instance of the application of the black and/or white psychological attitude in connection with the conditions in the Danube valley and particularly in connection with the late President of the Slovak Republic, Msgr. Dr. Joseph Tiso. We shall not go into the analysis of the causes of this attitude in our case even though they can be, without any doubt, revealed quite easily.

The Munich Agreement of 1938 was an affair of the big European powers of that time. The small nations could not help but take notice of the agreement by which Central Europe became the zone of influence of Germany. Since the great powers knew that it was a Nazi Germany, the small nations were compelled to take notice of this fact and steer the destiny of their respective nations through the troubled waters of the years to come. It is a curious fact, unfortunately not a unique one in the political history, that the same great powers, or more exactly a part of them, did not mind the putting to trial and sentencing of people, after World War II, simply because they had to accept what the great powers had agreed upon in Munich. Either they must concede that they were not able to see the immediate geopolitical consequence of what they were doing, or they must admit that they accepted a multiplicity of rights to life and rights to survive: one code for me, another, a modified one, to suit my interests for the others. First they objected to Nazi-Germany and later on — *grace a Dieu* — to the Soviet Union. It is not difficult to see that a contradiction in regard to fundamental moral principles is involved in this case.

However, let us look into the case which applies this time not directly to the whole area of Central Europe but specifically to Slovakia and only indirectly, though not less vitally, to the whole area of Central Europe. We are going to mention three instances of a public address of the late President Dr. Joseph Tiso which should not have escaped the attention of the people in charge of Central European affairs in respective Departments of Foreign Affairs in the Western World. The more so, since the Germans' reaction in all the three cases was utterly hostile.

1. In the Western-Slovakia town of Trnava, some 30 miles from the capital of Slovakia, Dr. Tiso said in August 1939: "Slovaks, do not think that what the Germans are doing for us they do because of their love for us (literally, "because of our beautiful blue eyes" — this expression comes from a Slovak proverb). They do it because it is in their interest to do so."

2. In speaking to the District Governors of Slovakia, Dr. Tiso said in the Redoute Hall in Bratislava: "Our participation in the present war is but a symbolic one."

3. On the occasion of the opening of the new Strážske-Vranov rail line, Dr. Tiso proclaimed in Prešov, a town situated in Eastern Slovakia: "The Slovak people will display more loyalty to the one who will help us to a more free life" (Not having the original texts at hand, the writer guarantees for the fidelity of the quoted sentences only as far as their genuine meaning is concerned).

In all the three instances, the President's speeches were broadcast throughout the whole territory of the Slovak Republic and to the personal knowledge of the writer the last two quotations were objected to in strong terms by the Germans.

The meaning of these speeches was clear to all concerned, including the Germans, and to the Beneš clique at that time preparing its comeback via Moscow.

What was the reaction to these speeches in Slovakia?

What we were interested in was whether these speeches will be noticed by those in charge of Central Europe in the State Department of the United States. Confidence towards the Americans of Slovak origin was in the eyes of Slovaks extended to the whole of the United States. Even towards the end of the war, when the present writer discussed with President Tiso his preferences of the then unknown zones of occupation of Germany and of Austria, in the opinion of the President it was the American zone of occupation that he wished for in the first place. In reality, however, the facts have shown that the French have manifested more understanding for the complexities of the Central European politics than did the military administration of the United States.

There were two points around which revolved the thinking of Dr. Joseph Tiso as regards the future of the Slovak people. First, it was the confidence in the United States as to the country of Washington, Lincoln, etc., and, last but not least, as to the country of the American Slovaks. In other words, the Slovaks had expected that the Government of the United States would not oppose the will of a nation to freedom. Secondly, Dr. Tiso ruled out in his thinking the possibility of creating a political vacuum in Europe after the war, because he knew that any political vacuum would be but an invitation to the Soviets who would not fail to intervene if not opposed by a military force superior to their own.

Now let us recall what was the situation during the war in Slovakia and what moves were expected by the Slovaks in regard to their political future. Call it whatever you want, call it unjustly a German protectorate or a German appendix, or call it according to no matter which names given to the Slovak Republic by the Beneš people and the Communists, the fact remains that the Slovak people, during the short period of the Slovak Republic, made greater progress in all fields of their national existence than during any period of time, entirely out of proportion with the six years, in the last centuries. On the other hand, the Slovak nation was very much aware of the fact that the conditions of their freedom were rather precarious in more than one regard, concerning both some of the internal and also international factors. The only positive approach to the Slovak people leads through what hindered their freedom and not through questioning their right to freedom. This was the meaning of the above messages of President Joseph Tiso to the Western World and in particular to the United States.

On the other hand, what was the political formula offered by the United Nations to the Slovak people? To put it bluntly, it can be briefly resumed in the following sentence: **give up your freedom.** Or in a more explicit way: if you want to get rid of what contradicts the way of life you are striving for, get rid of freedom. Or: there is no other way to cut loose from the accompanying phenomena that

hinder your freedom than to kill the whole thing, which is tantamount to the advice: throw out the child together with the bath water.

There was an inherent contradiction in this attitude that can be summed up as follows: in order to be free you must renounce freedom. In itself, this is a perfectly coherent assertion under the condition one qualifies the two meanings of freedom in a due way. Yet historically speaking the conditions were set either by the Nazis, on the one side, or by the Beneš people and the Communists, on the other side. President Tiso hoped that there might be a third condition, that is, that of the Slovak people, and that the United States might understand this. Dr. Tiso's political vision aimed at the transition from freedom conditioned by Nazi Germany (the history of this condition is not a univocal one; there were changes for better and for worse) to the freedom conditioned by the Slovak people.

Contrary to this legitimate expectation, on the Slovak people was imposed the Communist and the Beneš version of freedom which by no means was lacking an univocal significance whose depth of cruelty the Western World seems to be grasping only after the Hungarian tragedy of last Fall. In Slovakia we had a chance to see this version of freedom in an extremely lucid way during the so-called August "uprising" of 1944. This political movement might pass into history as the most curious and most ineffective and futile piece of political thinking. Ill-timed, wrongly executed, without any real significance as to war operations, its only result was to bring the war on the territory of Slovakia and to help Beneš to sell his version of "freedom" by building Potemkin villages to the West, yet replacing the rather humorous deceit of the famous Russian deceiver by the cruelty of the present-day power-holders of Russia.

What about the Slovak version of their freedom? For the time being its highest symbol is President Dr. Joseph Tiso. Historical events have imposed upon him this significance. The German military police (Sicherheitsdienst) gathered material towards the end of the war for a process against Dr. Joseph Tiso. The forecluded result of his show process would have been most probably the last and the definite qualification of the Nazi-Germany version of the

Slovak freedom. Where the Germans were stopped by the victory of the United Nations, the Beneš government faithfully carried on. The execution of the President of the Slovak Republic, the 10th anniversary of which the free Slovaks commemorated this year, was supposed to put an end to Slovak freedom.

It would seem that there can be no freedom for this people at all; that the Slovaks have to choose between the two or more pseudo-versions of freedom which must be always conditioned for the benefit of one of their neighbors, not in the sense of a loyal cooperation as might be arranged with justice in a federation of nations, but in the sense of being politically, economically, and culturally subjected by one of its neighbors. The Slovaks are not shocked to hear this. Yet they beg to differ radically from this opinion, both because of their conviction that they have the moral and political right to live freely, the Slovak way of life, in full respect of other peoples, and because they trust that the vitality of the American spirit of freedom is keen and strong enough to overcome the contradiction implied in the wartime pattern of political thinking concerning the Slovaks. Western wartime reporters had failed to report the above-mentioned messages of the late Msgr. Dr. Joseph Tiso to the responsible personalities of the U. S. Government. I am using the opportunity to do this on the tenth anniversary of the death on the gallows of the priest of whom his ecclesiastical superior, Archbishop Dr. Kmeťko, said: "It is because we knew him always as an exemplary priest that we wished him to accept the nomination for the Presidency of the Slovak Republic; he was a guarantee against the intrusion of Nazi ideology." Thus I am drawing attention of the United States Government to the political vision of Dr. Joseph Tiso, the vision of his Slovak people, i.e., not a Nazi version, nor a Communist one, nor a Czech version of Slovak freedom, but an honest-to-goodness Washington version of freedom which is a human one. By this I believe, I am only fulfilling, though somewhat belatedly, my duty connected with my being the former "personal secretary" of the late President of the Slovak Republic, Dr. Joseph Tiso.

DR. JOSEPH TISO: CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT

Dr. Joseph Paučo

The President of the Slovak Republic (1939—1945), who was executed by a pro-Communist regime on April 18, 1947, ranks among the outstanding figures of the central-European Christian Democratic movement. He was Dr. Joseph Tiso, ideologist of the Slovak Populist Party, which fought for the independence of Slovakia and since 1925 represented the majority of Slovak voting power. The philosophy motivating the Slovak Populist Party was **For God and Nation**, and it was in the spirit of this principle that Dr. Tiso embodied all his Christian Democratic politics.

"Let no one pause to wonder," he wrote, "that we work with God for the nation. God does not need the nation. God will be God even without a nation whether we admit the fact or not, but without God there can be no nation.... There is no sinful failing against God in allying the concepts 'For God, For Nation.' It means the binding of human values to values that are eternal, that are divine." (1)

Dr. Tiso affirmed that this clarion call "For God, for Nation" should intensify Christian idealism. His own words are: "Putting it in a practical way, this simply means that one (who cultivates Christian idealism) will not frustrate the influence of Christianity upon the life of a nation in its schools, its literature, its parliament; he will, on the contrary, use every opportunity to help Christianity enter more and more significantly into classrooms and lecture halls, into family life and into public life, for it is Christianity alone that can preserve the roots of idealism without which no nation can survive." (2)

Idealism and Christian morality are the *sine qua non* of the life of nations and society. "I rely on a weak analogy," declared Dr. Tiso, "when I say that if nature cannot survive without the beneficence of heat and sun, neither can human life endure without faith, without moral philosophy. The histories of nations and our personal experiences furnish evidence to substantiate the fact that whatever the light of faith and Christian morals was extinguished, there followed not only a decline in culture, truth and art, but also

a decay that affected the nation's economic system as well. A social order grounded in gross materialism, devoid of Christian idealism, cannot long endure, and a nation bred in materialism, grasping for matter alone, becomes like a withered shrub that stands in the midst of luxuriant verdure, a thing alien and repulsive to other nations.”(3)

Christianity imposes the obligation of love for one's nation. “Love for the nation is a religious precept, and anyone who does not foster a love for his nation violates the fourth commandment. He is branded not only as an earthly traitor, but also as a transgressor who profanes the law of God.”(4)

Chauvinism, on the other hand, he denounced as can be seen from these extracts: “A regulated love of self is the foundation of Christian charity. From this basic tenet there also evolves the proper concept of Christian nationalism. First comes love of one's own nation, then an extension of charity to others. Non-Christian nationalism is of an entirely different stock, loving self and hybridizing into chauvinism.”(5) “Nationalism, a kind of centering on self diffused on a national scale, is not only the indispensable drive in service for the nation, it is also the natural measure of obligation on the part of one nation toward other nations, just as love of self becomes the stimulating force or the incentive for self-improvement and the gauge of human relations. But in order to prevent self-love as well as nationalism from degenerating into formidable media of destruction, there must be an obligation which is expressed in the universally known precept: Love thy neighbor as thyself.”(6) According to the teaching of the Church, “nationalism loves its own but it must not hate what is other than its own; it builds its own but it may not destroy another's; it strengthens its own but it does not divide the whole.”(7)

One who is a believing Christian and a patriot works for the freedom of his nation because “the independence of a nation is a natural good which substantially affects not only the individual and his material and spiritual interests, but it concerns the entire national commonwealth. Since national freedom is then such a natural good that affects the

individual, the family and the entire national community, there can be nothing inappropriate in the gratitude which is shown to God in return for it. . . .

"For a nation to exist and yet not be independent means sentencing it to its extinction. If a nation is to exist, and there is proof of this in the fact that it now does exist, then that nation, by the will of God, must be free. . . .

"A nation must be granted its freedom, for without liberty it would in vain have the God-given gift of language; it would be unable to use it. In vain would it have a God-given territory; it would be unable to cultivate its land and make a living on it. Consequently if a nation is to live according to its intellectual endowments and character, it must be free in order to fulfill its destiny. The Divine Will, therefore, is for a nation to be independent and free." (8)

The liberty of a nation is protected by the State. As Tiso sees it, "The State is an organized body established for the welfare of the citizens. It is founded on the natural law, therefore on the will of the Creator, Who so created man that he can live and develop his mental and moral faculties only in association with other men. The State is a means to an end and not the end of man. It is for the State to serve the welfare of man, not for man to serve the State. This is the original design of the Creator from which, however, the developmental periphery of human society has steadily departed more and more.

"The State is founded on the individuality of its citizens whose interests it promotes rather than absorbs. The State does not assume the obligations of individuals but it discharges those functions that are essential for the life of all, tasks for which the capacities of the individual alone are not commensurate. Always and everywhere it must be the individual first and as far as his abilities can reach and only beyond that point may the State enter as a collective unit of strength. It is for the State to serve society, not society the State. The organization of the State is determined by the moral disposition, the physical capacity and the material potential of the nation. What holds in regard to the relationship of the individual to the State, likewise holds in regard to the family and the nation as a biological unit and

of the Church as a supernatural institution. The State does not assume and absorb their rights and their functioning; contrarily, it reinforces and as a collective organism it merely supplements whatever the family or the nation alone cannot provide or whatever would hinder the Church from attaining her mission. The State therefore should be the organ of the nation and not a medium of the arrogance, aggressiveness and violence of its representatives in authority. By its collective instrumentality it should promote individual enterprise and not thwart the development of the vigor of the nation by imposing excessive financial burdens. It is an institution of temporal welfare which does not interfere with supernatural aspirations but respects them because of their delicate bearing on the temporal well-being of society.”⁽⁹⁾

The State should respect the natural law and should not interfere in Church matters: “God is a power greater than man; the Church is more than the State. The State may not meddle in ecclesiastical affairs.”⁽¹⁰⁾

The State must submit to Christian ideals. “We subordinate the powers of the State to the laws of morality and justice. In keeping with this principle, the State must respect the rights of individuals, of families, of society and of local self-governing entities. It regards as sacred the right of parents to educate their children and the privilege of free religious profession. It guarantees the right of private ownership and insures the peaceful co-existence of employer and employee.”⁽¹¹⁾

It was only natural for Dr. Tiso as the ideologist of the Slovak Populist Party to conceive of the democratic structure of the State. “Just as it is an axiom for political activity to be concerned above all about the public good and about the common welfare,” writes Dr. Tiso, “so it is likewise true that political activity of such a nature is carried on more successfully on a democratic basis than on any other kind of foundation. The very root of the word, **demos** — **people**, signifies the universality of all the members of a nation, incidentally of a State, who are to be not merely passive but truly active in this common functioning. A democratic system brings up people for universality, for it

draws the widest possible public to share in the governing of the State, and thereby more and more come to be identified with the State. Consequently there is not only an awakening of responsibility in wide circles, but there is also established a definite degree of confidence in the directives that are promulgated, for in them the citizens see an expression of their will and of their effort to attain a better future. It is true that democracy presupposes a people educated for public service lest it degenerate into a mass easily swayed in the hands of oligarchs or political parties. Hence democracy can thrive only under Utopian or eminently ideal conditions. A foundation based on materialism will educe class struggle incited by selfishness and before long it will evolve into a dictatorship. In a democracy, however, this counterbalance of an ideally educated people insures a rich burgeoning of life and secures the firm consolidation of the State.”(12)

In defining the duties of a democratic government, Dr. Tiso stated: “A democracy is a regime according to the will of the people. It is a regime which makes it possible for the will of the people to be manifest in all that affects public life. Democracy in this sense implies that the citizens do not merely express their will or their preferences in regard to organization and government at election time or in various types of balloting, but in the interests of the people and in the spirit of true democracy as such, the educated stratum, the intellectuals, fully explain to the people the program proposed and the objectives of the political party and thus instruct the citizens.”(13)

“Democracy means putting into effective use every creative force in the State as well as appraising its every component unit according to its moral worth even in the event that the ruling power does not demand this.”(14)

Dr. Tiso dedicated himself to service in a Christian democracy: “We uphold the principle of democracy because democracy is consonant with Christian teaching and we will not permit it to become corrupted with Marxist and socialistic appendages.”(15) “We Slovaks are from our very souls adherents to this Christian democracy and we condemn every form of dictatorship regardless of the label under

which it may try to hide its true nature or identity. We pledge ourselves to stand for democracy but for democracy of the proper stamp." Not a mystified or mystifying democracy. "In the maelstrom of views and opinions on democracy, it seems that there is developing a conscious tendency. Out of an indefinite conception of democracy there is being shaped a mystique of democracy which would affect people and command their reluctant respect; none may dare to voice any question or to protest once the statement is made that democracy requires this or that; none may presume to question an arrangement, for if it is a democratic arrangement, it is the best possible arrangement. And thus there is fabricated the mystique of democracy." (16)

In a Christian democracy whatever holds in general extends also into individual departments, branches of public service and activity. Nor is it otherwise in the Christian democracy of Tiso. It may be helpful to examine in this connection a matter as weighty as the social problem. For the Slovak nation which had been so long the victim of foreign exploitation, this question bearing on the disposition of social affairs has been, and even after the overthrow of Communism it will still remain, a vital issue. Prime importance attaches especially to the relation between worker and employer; to the valuation attached not merely to property worth but also to labor; to the extent to which the government will identify itself with private initiative, and similar matters.

The Church has long since made a clear pronouncement on this subject. Both the **Rerum Novarum** and the **Quadragesimo Anno** are well known encyclicals containing for modern Christian democracy the entire teaching of the Church on socio-economic affairs. Slovak Populists have likewise built on these social encyclicals of the Popes. Hence it was but natural that Dr. Tiso made application from these documents of the Church in the light of Christian philosophy rather than from any other sources when he set about his task of settling the long neglected problem of economics and social justice in Slovakia.

He opposed class struggle and class hatred. "Instead of class warfare, we must cultivate mutual and national

Christian charity; by humility, simplicity and industry we must supplant rapaciousness, materialism and voluptuousness.”(17) “To every man his due and injustice to none! That is our watchword — no hollow-sounding catchword but an honored principle. If we do not wish to violate tradition, we must tolerate no privileged classes, no privileges of any kind whatever, no indulgence of prerogatives, whatever their origin may have been.”(18)

Dr. Tiso interprets Christian social politics as “founded on realistic assumption: it takes into account the nature of man composed of body and soul and conscious of this dual basis it classifies among the most potent agencies of the social order not mere material forces but rather spiritual and moral incentives, giving these precedence, in fact. Hence, it is not concerned solely about a crust of bread; it cares also for every man’s spirit, for sheer materialism can never satisfy man completely.”(19)

Christian socialism has always defended man’s right to own private property. Dr. Tiso realized that sometimes capitalism can go to extremes, since capitalists are in the money and on occasion “they use wealth only for self aggrandizement and not for the general good.”(20) On the other hand, although Dr. Tiso appreciated the deficiencies of capitalism, he consistently defended the principle of private ownership because he knew that the abrogation of ownership “would endanger both economic and cultural progress to a greater extent than does the capitalistic system, hedged about as it is by social policies.” (21) “In regard to the great question of individual ownership, considering it, for example, from the one extreme of liberalism to the opposite extreme of socialist communism,” Dr. Tiso emphasized, “we juxtapose our principle which asserts the sacredness of private ownership and the uninviolable right of the individual.”(22)

On the other hand, however, “let him who has capital make just returns; let him distribute it with labor, and satisfy labor with decent civic gain.” (23)

A Christian view of capital and the income derived from it differs from that of other systems. “Former systems of liberalism and capitalism,” Tiso wrote, “were al-

ways ready to calculate the profit that would accrue from an enterprise or a plant. Superficially it appears that income is the natural end of enterprise, but Catholic morality has long since taught that all the estates and properties of this world exist for man, for life. This truth is supported by the natural law also. Life is of higher value than gain. The theory that gain is of utmost value and importance must be invalidated. What is the world and everything in it for? For life, not for gain. Gain is subordinated to life and it may become an end only to the extent that it promotes life." (24)

And where is capital to be sought? "Out of the strong spiritual resources of our national character," declared Dr. Tiso, "not by any exploitation of those who are socially weaker than we ourselves. It is not an international capital, not impersonalized, not embodied in the worship of gold, but the capital of individuals happily at work in the interests of their nation and their State; a capital which is evidenced in morally strong individuals, in numerous families socially secure, in a contented society united in social justice, in the harmonious commerce of all the citizens who work under the aegis of an organized State." (25)

Capital and income are not produced except as the fruit of the laborer's toil. "We look upon work in an enlightened manner," Dr. Tiso asserted. "In it we see not only the creative force of economic values but the animate expression of human personality which has moral and social obligations; which a workingman therefore performs as his required contribution for the communal good and for which a wage is paid not only as the countervalue of energy expended or economic income achieved, but rather as a medium which in turn enables the laborer to satisfy all his obligations." (26)

"In the light of Christian teaching, work is not a burden; it is not a means for effecting gain; it is rather the life expression of a man who is the inevitable agent under all circumstances. Christianity proceeds from man and says 'God endowed you with physical, spiritual, and intellectual powers and faculties so that you might use them to advantage.' This is a noble and holy thought. Work is a requisite

for man even when he is already provided with sufficient resources for his livelihood.”(27)

He who works is entitled to a just wage. Humanity, in Dr. Tiso’s words, “drew out of our venerable Christian socio-national spirit many a fresh impetus for fulfilling the words of Scripture ‘The laborer is worthy of his hire’; to abide by the dictum of the same Scripture, ‘He who does not work, let him not eat’; to demolish the idol of the golden calf in imitation of the example of Scripture; to measure with the same measure of justice to all, as the Scripture commands for we are all the children of one Father Who is in heaven.”(28)

Everyone has a claim to work. And “we shall distribute pay only for work.” Dr. Tiso stresses this point, adding however, “We shall tolerate no unreasonable fomenting against capital. A workingman must not regard the capitalist as his enemy; on the other hand, a capitalist must realize that the capital, over which he is in reality only an administrator, essentially belongs to the nation in order to provide work and sustenance for all.”(29)

In short, the Christian-democratic system really “unites all — employers and workers — on the groundwork of a common interest: the material and moral well-being of the Slovak nation.”(30) In all undertakings there must be effected an attitude in which “each one, regardless of what type of work he does, will come to regard the work as his own and will perform it with that devotion which he would lavish on his own.”(31)

It is the Christian democracy more than any other political system that cares for “the fundamental cell of the State and of society in general: the family,” for the family “is the source from which all life is derived; it is the first school which educates one to think; it is the first temple which teaches one to pray; it is the first workshop which trains one to work; and it is also the first social bond which instructs one to live in the company of others in the spirit of love and equity. For this reason we must resist anything that may tend to ruin or impair the family and we must support everything that shall contribute to its unity and solidarity. . . .

"Therefore one prime concern shall be to foster the establishment of the family and to insure the material prerequisites for its existence. For the benefit of every type of employee, then, but especially for the laborer, measures must be taken to legislate a so-called family wage or familial pay to enable a young man to contract marriage and by a suitable scale of subsidies for wife and children (a scale graduated according to their number) be assured a decent livelihood and proper education. Obviously this measure is also intended to provide a solution to the problem of married women now under employment. The ideal is to return married women to the family circle, for they are called to manage and maintain the government of the household and their proper place is the home."(32)

Mankind as a Christian-democratic entity requires for its social security not only a family wage but also a settlement of housing policies. On this score Dr. Tiso observed, "Family life must be encouraged also by providing healthful and reasonably priced living quarters. . . . A reasonable and hygienic housing unit is just as essential to family life as a decent income earned by the breadwinner."(33)

"A family will be placed on the foundations where it properly belongs only when it has respectable quarters. When I say 'respectable quarters,' I mean that the home must qualify for the occupation of a family. . . . A guiding principle must be: to have a home in keeping with one's social standing."(34)

"We must devote considerable attention to educate our people in regard to housing culture. The general cultural level of a nation is often judged by its housing culture and this also enters into the reasons why we are concerned about the living conditions of our Slovak residents in small towns and in the suburbs. Without improving housing conditions, one can hardly raise the level of the population or improve the position of the family."(35)

In a Christian State, the family must be an exemplary unit in every respect. That is the reason why so much attention is devoted to preparation for family living. This was Dr. Tiso's attitude on the subject:

"We shall provide for the family by supporting the

education of youth designedly for family living, by providing moral safeguards for children and by arranging socio-medical conferences for those contemplating marriage as well as for those who are married, especially mothers.”(36) Also: “We regard solicitude for the Slovak child as the most sublime aspect of social care.”(37)

The Christian-democratic State watchfully takes note of all social problems. It resolves difficulties and extends help to every level of its inhabitants that may require the support of State authority. In this manner it seems even to encroach upon private ownership. But this is really no encroachment in the usually accepted sense of the word; it is rather a kind of mediation and vigilance. Dr. Tiso advocates, for example, that the government “should provide for the unemployed by creating jobs for them” or even by “introducing a working obligation.” “The government considers it a duty to feel responsible for the employed as well as for the unemployed. Protection for the workers will be perfected by more thorough supervision in regard to the wage claims of employees as well as in the matter of safety and security measures to safeguard the health and the lives of the workers, but, above all, in provisions to protect the existence of the employees...”(38)

If projects are not managed in accordance with the natural law, the government calls for mediation or collective bargaining. “True, it is not easy to translate the natural law into action. Herein devolves a difficult assignment for the State. The State must put the natural law into concrete expression, an application appropriate to prevailing circumstances. Allow me to illustrate this point by an example: A family wage is obligatory under the natural law. Realizing this and anxious to secure the greatest possible success in his business, a manufacturer plans to hire single men only. This amounts to cudgelling life. The State must find a remedy for such a situation, some means by which to help large families and likewise to secure the prosperity of enterprising business. In some states all the workers are allotted the same pay but a definite portion of their earnings is withheld. Out of this reserve, compensation is then distributed to workers with large families. In other states, a

financing administration supplements the work of the laborers to effect a family wage. It covers its own replacement for this outlay out of taxes that accrue from the entire national collective.”(39)

In a word, the role of a Christian democracy — according to Dr. Tiso — is to build “a State of Christian order in which laws are carried out in spirit of responsibility to the supreme authority of God; in which Christian thoughts of justice and charity are the basic pillars of social and moral order; in which the training of children is carried out in keeping with the eternal principles of Christ, the supreme Pedagogue; in which the fundamental cell of social life, the family, is protected by the defense of unity and indissolubility; in which there reigns not the terror of brute force and physical violence, but the spirit of true moral liberty.”(40)

Dr. Tiso ardently promoted a Christian democracy which was supported by both of the Christian components of the Slovak nation, for he was convinced that “along with Catholic universality and Catholic idealism, Lutheran individualism and realism can be used beneficially in politics. When all these attributes are combined then not even the gates of hell can prevail against our common front. Catholic populists and Lutheran Nationalists, we must cooperate and neither covet nor seize. Let us not forget that we are allying ourselves in the cause of national politics and that there is here no possibility of joining with Catholics of other nationalities.”(41)

What motives prompted this alliance and this insistence that the independent Slovak Republic be organized on Christian-democratic principles? This alone that a Christian world-view and Christian democracy contain lasting values. Dr. Tiso declared:

“We do not design our ideological activity for a week or for a month, but we come and we look always — and this is our peculiar characteristic — in a manner which is intended for the ages — eternally. Eternally, as the Slovak nation is to last, and from this eternal existence of the Slovak nation we derive practical applications for our temporal problems and tasks. . . . Whoever prides himself on being a

loyal son of the nation must also consider what he contributes to the nation: whether it is an infection which induces fever, or germs which destroy and can bring the nation to its grave, or labor which abides in the nation eternally like a cell of healthy social and cultural development.”(42)

Because of this peculiar feature of Christian democracy, we must return to it repeatedly and draw upon it always.

Naturally, the Communists regarded a political leader of this caliber as their key enemy and, consequently, Msgr. Joseph Tiso was the first Catholic prelate from behind the Iron Curtain singled out to make the supreme sacrifice in the struggle with Communism. However, “as a martyr to his love for the nation, Dr. Tiso will continue to live in the nation.”(43) Dr. Tiso is a martyr for the cause of freedom and fittingly he ranks with Washington and many other great men of history.”(44)

(1) Daily “Slovák” 1939, No. 189, Bratislava, Slovakia.

(2) “Slovák” 1924, 92.

(3) “Tatranský Orol”, Vol. VI, No. 4.

(4) “Slovák” 1939, 197.

(5) “Slovák” 1934, 113.

(6) Ideológia Slovenskej Ľudovej Strany, pg. 25.

(7) “Kultúra” 1933, No. 9, Trnava, Slovakia.

(8) “Slovák” 1940, 227.

(9) “Slovák” 1938, 293.

(10) “Slovák” 1934, 221.

(11) “Slovák” 1939, 44.

(12) Ideológia, pg. 123-124.

(13) “Slovák” 1935, 150.

(14) “Slovenská Pravda” 1937, No. 74, Bratislava.

(15) “Slovák” 1938, 243.

(16) “Slovák” 1936, 178.

(17) “Slovák” 1924, 92.

(18) “Slovák” 1938, 249.

(19) Ideológia, pg. 118-119.

(20) “Slovák” 1938, 283.

(21) Ideológia, p. 118.

(22) “Slovák” 1925, 278.

(23) “Slovák” 1938, 283.

(24) “Slovák” 1941, 13.

(25) Prvé Posolstvo.

(26) Posolstvo.

- (27) "Slovák" 1941, 105.
- (28) "Slovák" 1940, 186.
- (29) "Slovák" 1938, 243.
- (30) "Slovák" 1938, 283.
- (31) "Slovák" 1940, 186.
- (32) "Slovák" 1939, 44.
- (33) "Slovák" 1939, 44.
- (34) "Slovák" 1941, 37.
- (35) "Slovák" 1939, 44.
- (36) Ibidem.
- (37) Ibidem.
- (38) Ibidem.
- (39) "Slovák" 1941, 37.
- (40) "Kultúra" 1933, 9.
- (41) "Slovák" 1932, 237.
- (42) "Slovák" 1941, 17.
- (43) Vatican Radio April 28, 1947.
- (44) Congressman Alvin O'Konski May 31, 1948, at Bedford, O.

• • •

Castles of Slovakia:

I L A V A

The name Ilava may be more familiar to the outside world, because it has been mentioned more frequently than names of other castles and citadels of Slovakia. Political prisoners, "enemies of the state," are confined within its walls today by the communist regime of Prague.

Just when the Ilava Castle was built is not definitely known; but we do know that it already existed at the end of the twelfth century. The first known written account of Ilava from that time states that "Castrum Ilava" was the property of the Knights Templars, who also occupied other castles in the Váh Valley. Ilava (Trenčín County) was held by the Templars until the Order was abolished in 1312. The castle is situated on the left bank of the Váh near the railroad station. Its origin may go back to the times of the Great Moravian Empire.

After the dissolution of the Knights Templars, Ilava Castle passed into the hands of the "mighty Lord of the Váh and the Tatras," Matthew Čák (Tchak) of Trenčín, who made of it a mighty fortress. It remained in his possession to his death, when all of Čák's holdings were seized by the

king. Thomas Transilvanus, one of the imperial "castle captains," resided in Ilava in about 1339, according to historical records, which also state that about fifty years later, the king donated Ilava to one Bukovec, whose son Henry (Imrich) joined up with Ladislaus of Naples against the king. As a result, the king seized all of Henry's holdings, including Ilava.

The Hussites under Procopius Holý plundered northern sections of Slovakia and took Ilava, but did not hold it long. The army of King Sigmond under Nicholas Rozhanovský stormed the castle and seized it after a bloody battle in which 5000 men perished. Sigmond ordered Ilava demolished. Several years later, however, the Ilava Castale was rebuilt and presented to Queen Barbara; after her Queen Elizabeth resided there.

During the second invasion of Slovakia by the Hussites, under John Jiskra of Brandýs, Ilava was besieged and then taken. The Hussites, however, were again evicted and Ilava enjoyed a comparatively peaceful time even though its owners were changed often. Ladislaus Huňady, Blaze Maďar and Stephen Zápoľský occupied it in that order. At the end of the 15th century, angered at John Zápoľský, Stephen's son, the king sent General Katzianer to take over Ilava. After a short siege Ilava fell. In 1571, Ilava and its surroundings were given to the Ostrozič brothers, who were of Croatian origin; the king, however, won this back after the rebellion in which the Ostrozič brothers participated was squelched.

General Heister of the imperial army stormed Ilava in 1670 and shortly thereafter sold it to Count Braeuner for 80,00 Goldens. The Count added a twin-towered church and had the upper part of Ilava rebuilt into a monastery and then called in the Trinitarian Monks to occupy it, keeping the lower part of the castle for himself. The Trinitarians resided in the Ilava Castle until their Order was dissolved in 1725. After the defeat of Count Braeuner, his heirs sold Ilava to the Hungarian State, which converted it into a state prison; more additions to Ilava have been made since that time. Ilava is the "Alcatraz" of Slovakia.

• • •

Kerner's "Czechoslovakia" (Cont'd.)

HISTORY OR PROPAGANDA?

P. A. HROBAK

"The Czechoslovak Declaration and the letter to Emperor Charles were published in the Saturday morning papers, October 19, 1918, the two appearing in many papers in parallel columns; the reply of President Wilson quoted above came on the Monday following.

"It was still thought that American public opinion was not sufficiently informed; while the men mentioned above were trying to devise what to do next, the suggestion was made that, if a declaration were issued from Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it would make a striking impression on the American people. They immediately consulted the State Department and obtained its approval, **provided Professor Masaryk took the leadership**. The members of the Mid-European Union were immediately summoned on Saturday morning, the nineteenth, and a preliminary draft of a declaration was made. The following Wednesday, the Union met in Independence Hall and continued in session until Saturday noon, with Masaryk as chairman. The discussion, which was heated at times, was concentrated on controversies between the various groups.

"Because of the prominence attained by Professor Masaryk through the Declaration on Saturday, the press gave the meeting much space, **and minimized the often bitter discussion**. Saturday noon a Declaration of Common Aims was read by Professor Masaryk in the courtyard back of Independence Hall. This Declaration was really the first statement leading to the Little Entente."

It would be interesting, indeed, if a copy of Masaryk's "**original**" draft of the Declaration were available. It is significant, however, that many less valuable and important documents were preserved and recorded by T. G. Masaryk in their original forms. **Masaryk made less of the Declaration than did Mr. Miller**. Referring to it in his "SVĚTOVÁ REVOLUCE" (p. 364), Masaryk said:

"...the form was chosen in such a way as to remind Americans of their own beautiful Declaration; **ultimately its value was tactical**.... In the Declaration, I repudiated Charles' late attempt to promote an Austrian pseudo-federation and outlined the essential principles on which the Provisional Government was building the foundations of the new state. The first outline I gave to read to a group of my own friends (among them Brandeis and editor Bennet); an objective and formal criticism of it was undertaken by a small com-

mittee, which made the final revision along formal and legal lines (Mr. Calfree, a remarkable expert and lawyer, was a member of it); this was a nice example of harmonious cooperation and, at the same time, **the first state act of great style**, made under my direction. I delivered the Declaration to State Secretary Lansing so that I might insure agreement of the American Government beforehand; also so that even at the last moment before his reply to Austria I might remind Wilson of our stand."

Who was right: Masaryk or Miller? Of course, they could both be right — each in his own way: the main thing was to sell Masaryk and Czecho-Slovakia to the American public, and especially to President Wilson and his advisers. Masaryk's draft of the "Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence," according to Mr. Miller, was scrapped — **"the original typewritten copy was cut into more than a hundred pieces and pasted together in different order and then revised again and again"** — but **"great care was taken to keep all the meaning of the original"**!

And great care was taken to destroy Masaryk's original, of course! From all this it is obvious that Masaryk, despite arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, knew little about American democracy, which he wanted to exploit so that he might create his own special brand of **"Czechoslovak"** democracy. But why did Mr. Herbert Adolphus Miller, in the light of statements above, state categorically: **"The Declaration of Independence, written by Masaryk, not only embodied his own philosophy but also reflected the past and foreshadowed a future of which his countrymen approved"**? Are we to believe that is why Masaryk's version was scrapped and the committee's accepted??

CHAPTER XV — **"The Religious Situation in Czechoslovakia"** — by Matthew Spinka, B.D., Ph.D., "Associate Professor of Church History in the Chicago Theological Seminary and in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago; editor of **Church History**, published by the American Society of Church History, and the Society's **Studies in Church History**; author of: **The Church and the Russian Revolution** (1927); **A History of Christianity in the Balkans** (1933); **Christianity Confronts Communism** (1936-1938); **Chronicle of John Malalas** (1940); and numerous articles."

Spinka's account, partial and notoriously biased against

the Catholic Church, is not a true account of "the religious situation in Czecho-Slovakia." In it one finds, for the most part, the Protestant or "Hussite" version of the "progressive" CZECHS, which purposefully tends to falsify and confuse the true picture. In the entire 18 pages of the chapter, Slovakia and the Slovaks are limited to several sentences, which clearly indicate that the author was not interested in presenting a factual account. In reading this chapter, readers should bear this in mind, otherwise they may fall for a distorted and biased version of a situation that did not prevail even in the Czech lands, and so much the less in Slovakia.

"Furthermore, there was likewise a **considerable difference in the character of Slovak and Czech Catholicism**, which manifested itself in the continuous and sometimes **violent** political opposition to the Czechs. This opposition was led chiefly by the priesthood, with the famous Msgr. Andrej Hlinka, the papal prothonotary and a member of the Czechoslovak Senate at their head. It is significant that the instrument of the **violent** rupture between Slovakia and Bohemia-Moravia which occurred in March, 1939, was a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Tiso" — (p. 289).

Indeed, it is significant, that Spinka conveniently forgot to back this statement with proof of the "violence" resorted to by the Slovaks. The tendency is only too obvious. The fact is that Msgr. Hlinka and Msgr. Tiso, were not the instruments of the "violent" rupture between Slovakia and Bohemia-Moravia in 1939. But even if we grant that they were, who was more responsible for the situation that obtained in Czecho-Slovakia in 1939 than the Beneš Czechs?

• • •

"When the Pact of Munich delivered the **CZECH nation** into the hands of the Nazi regime of the Reich, unfortunately a faction within the Catholic Church thought it an opportune moment to further **their program**. This was a militant, aggressive group of Catholics, with Jaroslav Durych as one of their leaders, who once more identified their cause with the opposition to the **democratic Masaryk orientation of CZECH culture**. This noisy, denunciatory, fanatical faction tried to substitute the **ultramontane policies symbolized in CZECH history by St. Václav for the liberal, Protestant-inspired policies represented by the tradition of Jan Hus, and Jan Amos Comenius, AS REPRESENTED BY PRESIDENT MASARYK**. But with the setting up of the "Protectorate" in March, 1939, the momentary flare-up of religious intolerance subsided. It should be stressed that the **responsible political leaders of the Catholics, such as Msgr. Dr.**

Šrámek, did not share the views of the militant group, and remained loyal and faithful to the Masaryk-Beneš orientation" — (p. 292).

Please note well: The CZECHS, including **"responsible political leaders of the Catholics, SUCH AS MSGR. DR. ŠRÁMEK,"** scrapped the traditions of St. Wenceslaus for the policies of Hus and Comenius, **"AS INTERPRETED BY PRESIDENT MASARYK"**! What, then, does non-Catholic Spinka use as a yardstick for **"responsible political leaders"** of CZECH Catholics?

• • •
 "Of those (CZECHS) who seceded from the Roman Church after the setting up of the Republic, **the majority organized themselves into an anti-papal, nationalistic Czechoslovak Church.** This body had its inception in the efforts of the "Unity of (CZECH) Catholic Clergy," which in 1919 undertook to wrest from the papal curia certain reforms which had been formulated two years earlier.... Seeing the hopelessness of the task of obtaining their demands, the (CZECH) leaders of the **reformists** decided upon the radical measure of setting up a new (CZECH) national church. At the convention of the (CZECH) reformist clergy held on January 8, 1920, the Czechoslovak Church was organized" — (p. 293).

This paragraph and others following on the "Czechoslovak National Church" significantly lack the qualification **"CZECH"** for reasons best known to Mr. Spinka. The parenthetical inclusions here and below (CZECH) are not Spinka's, but mine, to indicate clearly that the "Czechoslovak National Church" — which had the blessing of Masaryk and Beneš and their socialistic followers — was strictly a CZECH venture, nothing SLOVAK about it.

• • •
 "The new (CZECH) Czechoslovak Church grew with astonishing rapidity.... The movement at first was (CZECH) Catholic, even though modernist and nationalist in character, **but distinctly and bitterly anti-papal and anti-Roman.** It was in no sense a Protestant body, and at first did not wish to be so considered, although in the course of time it joined the ranks of Protestant communions" — (p. 294-295).

• • •
 "As for the cultural and religious life of the nation, despite its relative numerical inferiority, **the Protestant element has played a role far beyond its strength in numbers.** The president-liberator, Thomas G. Masaryk, had become early in life, a convert to Protestantism, and remained a member of the **Czech Brethren Church** to the end. A large number of other political leaders were and are

likewise members of one or another Protestant communion: **Štefá-nik**, the leader of the Slovaks during the struggle for independence; **Premier Hodža**, who served during the critical period in 1938; and **Ivan Dérer**, who was minister of education in the Hodža cabinet; in this group also are to be found ministers **Slávik**, **Hurban**, and **Osuský** all of whom are grouped about Dr. Eduard Beneš in his struggle for the restoration of Czechoslovak independence" — (p. 300).

If the "Protestant element" played "**a role far beyond its strength in numbers**" in a country that was predominantly Catholic (over 75 percent). there must have been some reason for it. The same element practically had a monopoly on political life. Masaryk, Spinka told us, was a member of the CZECH Brethren, while the Slovaks mentioned were Protestants, but he conveniently forgot to tell us just what Freemason Beneš was. According to Spinka, Slovak Catholicism manifested itself in "violent" opposition, but he failed to mention the fact that the Masaryk-Beneš Czechs, sworn enemies of the Roman Catholic Church, the faith of the vast majority of the population of Czecho-Slovakia, were also "violent" in their opposition. In his blinded hatred for the Catholic population, especially the Slovaks, Beneš, sold out Czecho-Slovakia to Hitler in 1938 and to Stalin in 1943. The Slovaks, as a nation, were opposed to the restoration of "Czechoslovak" independence, because it meant enslavement by the Marxist Czechs.

It was thoughtful of Mr. Spinka to mention the fact that "the two outstanding CZECH philosophers, both pupils and disciples of Masaryk" also are Protestants: "Professor **E. Rádl**, whose originality in the treatment of ideas has made him justly famous; and Professor **Jan B. Kozák**, the son of an outstanding minister and himself formerly a minister of the Czech Brethren Church, who was until recently the leading member of the philosophical faculty of the University of Prague. He is at present teaching at Oberlin College."

Likewise that "among the theologians, none is more outstanding than Professor **J. L. Hromádka**, of the Jan Hus Theological Faculty, at present a member of the faculty of **Princeton Theological Seminary**..." All these "outstanding CZECH philosophers" — pupils and disciples of Hus and Masaryk — are doing nicely, thank you, under the

Red Czech regime of Prague. Hromádka returned to Prague ten years ago to head the "Czechoslovak National Church; when the Czech Reds took over all power in February 1948, Hromádka and his Czech church voluntarily offered to co-operate 100 percent! It would seem that the Czech "reformers" are continually reforming against Christianity!

(Continued)

• • •

The History of Slovakia:

By PHILIP A. HROBAK

CHAPTER THREE

AFTER THE FALL OF GREAT MORAVIA

There are no clear and reliable reports in historical sources to tell us when and under what circumstances Mojmir's country lost its independence. It is possible that the Slovak army, which clashed with the enemy so frequently, together with courageous Mojmir II, the last of the early Slovak rulers, perished in a final battle for the freedom of Slovakland. However, it is also possible that Mojmir II, exhausted by constant warfare and without outside help in sight, did not venture into another war which he could not possibly win.

Mojmir II in his ten-year reign proved on more than one occasion that he was a sagacious ruler, and we can be certain that in those trying times he did what he deemed best for his country. From reliable sources we can learn only that in 906 A. D. Mojmir's country no longer was an independent state, because the Magyars marched through Slovakia in that year to aid the Slovanic Glomaches in their fight against the Saxons.

Slovakia did not immediately fall prey to the Magyars who passed through it into neighboring countries on foraging expeditions. Slovakia only ceased to be an independent state. She no longer had her own ruler and could no longer defend herself, but she did not as yet belong under the rule of a foreign state. The German empire, exposed to the at-

tacks of Magyar hordes, could not take possession of Slovakia, and the nomadic Magyars did not establish any kind of state for quite some time. The Slovaks, then, lost their state, but did not lose or abandon the country which they already had occupied for several centuries and, therefore, regarded it as their own homeland.

The Slovaks retreated gradually from the open valleys near the Danube and the Tisa rivers to the North and settled in the hilly areas of Slovakia where they were relatively safe. Slovak geographical names along the banks of the Danube and Tisa show how far the land of the Slovaks extended in the tenth century.

Despite all the calamities that befell Slovakia, her people preserved itself on her soil. At the foot of mountains, in the extensive valleys and deep gorges of Slovakland, that people safeguarded its language, its time-honored customs and its Slovanic nature. The people of Slovakia did not mingle with other nations and, therefore, did not succumb to foreign influences.

At the beginning of the tenth century, when the Slovak nation lost its political independence, Slovakia had behind it a full century of cultural development which began during the reign of Prince Pribina. Christian culture, which came to the Slovaks from Bavarian Passau (Pasov), Regensburg (Rezno), and Salzburg (Sol'nohrad) and met with the Christian culture of Byzantium, sank such deep roots in Slovakia that it spread from the Slovaks, with the help of Slovak princes and priests, even to the neighboring nations. And this Christian culture outlived the fall of Great Moravia, became the permanent heritage of the Slovak nation, and gave the Slovaks a cultural and moral precedence over their eastern conquerors. With this heritage the Slovak nation placed itself firmly and for all time among the cultured nations of Europe.

Even at the height of Magyar aggression, the ecclesiastical organization of Slovakland did not vanish completely. Nitra continued to be the center of religious life. It is possible that even after Wiching's death the bishopric was preserved in Nitra, and it is probable that even the Zobor monastery, in which, according to legend, King Svä-

topluk died, survived all storms and was the center of Christian culture in the tenth century.

The rulers of Great Moravia established in Slovakia a good state organization along western lines. The whole country was divided into smaller districts, called counties ("župy" or "stolice"), which were governed by commissioners ("župani"), who resided in castles or citadels ("hrady"). Some of these counties constituted a geographical unit with natural boundries and undoubtedly originated from territories of tribal principalities. These counties retained their significance even after the fall of Great Moravia. The most ancient Slovak castles or citadels, which served as places of refuge for inhabitants of the respective counties, date from this period.

The Slovaks had been farmers and husbandmen for several centuries and, therefore, knew how to till the soil and raise livestock. Besides the old Slovanic art, which they brought from their old home beyond the Carpathian Mountains, they learned new trades from their neighbors, as is attested to by relics found in old Slovak castles and graves. The people of Slovakia did business with their neighbors; foreign merchants frequently came into Slovakia, bringing with them various commodities, and established places of business beneath the walls of Slovak citadels where marketplaces sprang up in the ninth and tenth centuries.

The Slovak nation, therefore, possessed all the prerequisites to live in its own country even without a state of its own.

SLOVAKIA ANNEXED BY HUNGARY

Two states originated in the tenth century on the territory which once belonged under the rule of King Svätopluk: the Czech State in the west, and the Hungarian State in the east. These states, heirs to Great Moravia, developed gradually over the years.

About fifteen various Czech tribes inhabited the territory known as Bohemia, which were being united under the rule of the princes of the Přemysl clan. Prague became the main stronghold of Bohemia in the tenth century. The Přemysl rulers broke with the Moravian kingdom soon after Svätopluk's death, recognized the supremacy of the

German empire, accepted Christianity, and began to build a united state on both banks of the Vltava river. Eventually the Czech nation evolved from the union of these tribes in the land of the Boii, Bohemia.

One of the outstanding rulers of early Bohemia was Saint Wenceslaus (920—929 A.D.), who concerned himself with consolidating Christianity and living in peace with the Germans to spare his country and nation from a catastrophe that would have resulted from a war with them. Wenceslaus' friendly attitude with the Germans made his brother Boleslav furious. His plan to put Wenceslaus out of the way was successful, and Boleslav took over the reigns of government after Wenceslaus' murder. But even Boleslav had to yield to the Germans and pay them annual tribute. Succeeding Czech rulers also recognized their dependency on the German empire and helped the German emperors in their frequent wars with their neighbors.

The Czech ruler Bořivoj was baptized by St. Methodius during King Svätopluk's reign. When St. Methodius died, many of the Slovanic priests persecuted by Svätopluk escaped from Great Moravia into Bohemia. Thus it happened that the Slovanic liturgy was spread throughout Bohemia where it was used along with the Latin liturgy in the tenth century. Among the Slovanic priests who spread Christianity in Bohemia were also a number of Slovaks. It is very likely that Gorazd, successor to St. Methodius, lived in Bohemia and continued in the work which he was forced to abandon in Slovakia. Thus it was that the young Czech state became heir to the territory and the Christian culture of Great Moravia.

In the second half of the tenth century the Czech rulers succeeded in uniting all the Czech tribes to build up a comparatively strong state, which—even though dependent on the German empire—made its own expeditions into neighboring countries and extended its boundaries eastward. In 973 A. D. a bishopric was established in Prague, which helped to unify and strengthen the Czech state.

But the Hungarian state — which in the later half of the tenth century gradually developed on the territories once ruled by Prince Pribina and his son Kocel (Transda-

nubia)—also became partial heir to Svätopluk's empire and the Christian culture of Great Moravia. The new state inherited not only the lands once governed by the Slovak rulers, but also the culture which had been developed in those lands during the reign of Slovak rulers. The builders of this new state became the Magyars who settled in the fertile Transdanubian territory of Pannonia at the close of the ninth century, after the wild Huns and the bellicose Avars had abandoned the territory.

The Magyars were of Turkish-Tartar (Mongolian) origin. Their ancient homeland was somewhere in southern Russia, north of the Black Sea. Like other nations of those times, the Magyars, too, were divided into several tribes until Arpad united them. Because they were exposed to frequent attacks of wild nomadic tribes, the Magyar tribes near the Black Sea began to migrate westward. Under Arpad's leadership they crossed the Carpathian Mountains and, during Svätopluk's reign in Great Moravia, conquered Pannonia, whence they menaced all neighboring nations. The Magyars fought on the side of the Germans against Svätopluk and Mojmir II and, therefore, contributed to the downfall of the Great Moravian Empire at the opening of the tenth century.

Nomadic and bellicose in their habits, the Magyars spent most of their lives in the saddle. They were renowned horsemen who specialized in surprise raids on their neighbors. Their swift cavalry units pierced far into foreign lands, swooped down upon rich towns and monasteries to raid them and then, laden with spoils, returned to their encampments. They destroyed whatever they could not haul away. Like all nomads they avoided hard work, spent their time in roisterous living, ate raw meat, drank soured mare's milk, shaved most of their heads and braided the rest of their hair into queues.

The Magyars were exceptionally bold and cruel. Their depredatory expeditions took them into the Balkan states, Italy and France, but they looted Germany more often than any other European country.

The Magyars suffered a serious setback in 955, when King Otto crushed their forces near Augsburg. Otto's army

also had a well equipped Czech division. Most of the Magyar invaders perished in battle, but many drowned in the river Lech. After this catastrophe, the Magyars abandoned their predatory expeditions and changed their manner of living. To save themselves they had to settle down and live in peace with the neighbors. In time the adventurous warriors became shepherds and farmers who learned to till the soil from their Slovanic neighbors.

Bavarian missionaries came to the Magyars to instruct them in the Christian faith with which they already had become acquainted through their Slovanic neighbors. At the same time missionaries came also from the East so that the currents of western and eastern culture met on the territory of the rising state of Hungary. But Christianity took hold with difficulty among the Magyars who, by their very nature, did not know how to orientate themselves at Christian teaching.

At the close of the tenth century, St. Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, came to Hungary and labored with his band of missionaries to convert the Magyars to Christianity. At that time Hungary was ruled by Géza (972—997), who was building a new state in the territory of Pribina's and Kocel's principality. Géza already was a Christian, but still followed many pagan customs. His son Vajk took the name of Stephen at baptism and very zealously continued in the work of consolidating Christianity and building the Hungarian State.

The nucleus of the political organization of the Hungarian State was Pannonia, the country which already during the reign of the Slovak princes in the ninth century had played a prominent role in the political and cultural history of central Europe. Slovakia, however, became the nucleus of the ecclesiastical organization of Hungary. It was the same Slovakia which already from the times of Pribina was a Christian country, the land which already during the reign of King Svätopluk had its own bishop and which, at the beginning of the 11th century, became the territory of the first and most significant Hungarian archbishopric, that of Ostrihom (Esztergom).

The greater part of the territory, inhabited from time

immemorial by the Slovaks, lying east of the Moravia river and north of the Danube, namely, Slovakia, became a part of the Hungarian state sometime at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century. But the western part of the Slovak land, which extended along the central flow of the Moravian river—from which it received its name Moravia (Morava)—seceded from Slovakia during those turbulent times. After losing its independence and a part of its territory, the Slovak nation, pressed on all sides by its stronger neighbors, did not have sufficient space to increase numerically and use all its energy to contribute to the building of its own life. Under such conditions the Slovaks remained a small nation, but even as such, they did not perish amidst the turbulent currents of history which swept over their country for long centuries.

Into the new state, which was to be the home of the Slovak people for almost a thousand years, the Slovaks brought everything they had inherited from the times of their state independence. First of all, they excelled over the rest of the nations living in Hungary with their Christian culture. As has been frequently demonstrated in history, so even in this case it was proven that a nation's culture is far more important than its numerical strength and military might.

Slovakia, with the remnants of her ecclesiastical organization and state administration from the times of her political independence, preserved her individual status even in the new state of Hungary. After Slovakland was annexed to Hungary, it played a significant role in the building of the new state. This role was especially useful during the formation of international relations between Hungary and the German Empire, Bohemia and Poland, and in the building of internal relationships within the Hungarian state as well.

When Hungary was on friendly terms with her western and northern neighbors, Slovakia served as a bridge for making friendly contacts. However, when Hungary was at odds with her neighbors, Slovakia became the battlefield on which issues were settled. The armies of the German Emperor, who wanted to establish his rule over Hun-

gary, the Czech armies which helped the German Emperor, and the army of the Polish king who became unfriendly with the Hungarian ruler, often tore into Slovakia, devastated the land and killed its people.

At the very beginning of the 11th century, St. Stephen of Hungary quarreled with the mighty Polish ruler, Boleslaw the Brave (Chrabrý). Polish troops invaded Hungary and occupied the whole of Slovakia as far as the Danube. The Polish occupation of Slovakia, however, was short-lived, because Boleslaw had other wars on his hands at that time and, therefore, was glad to give up Slovakia and conclude a peace pact with King St. Stephen.

St. Stephen was an outstanding ruler; he vanquished his enemies and, by propagating Christianity, fought against the paganism which still prevailed among the Magyars. He founded several Episcopal Sees and monasteries in order to strengthen the unity of the Hungarian State with the aid of ecclesiastical organizations. But pagan chieftains in the southern and eastern regions of his domain revolted against the zealous Christian king. During these crises Stephen found aid and succor in Slovakia. The Slovak magnates Hunt and Poznan gave the King military aid against the pagan rebels and helped to safeguard the integrity of the Hungarian State and Christianity in the Danube basin.

Stephen, aware of the fact that various nations inhabited the territory of the Hungarian State, wanted each nation to regard Hungary as its homeland. He trained his son and successor Emery accordingly, that he, too, might rule wisely and justly all the nations of his kingdom. To St. Stephen is ascribed the dictum: A state with only one language is weak.

(To be continued)

• • •
WHO SAID IT?

"Some pussy-footing ostriches criticize the treaty between Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia. Our close collaboration with the Soviet Union needs no explanation. We do not want anything from the Russians except protection from the Germans, and the Russians want nothing whatsoever from us." — (Ján Masaryk, BUSINESS WEEK, May 13, 1944).

Officers of the Slovak League of America

(Organized May 26, 1907, Cleveland, Ohio)

Honorary Presidents

Dr. Peter P. Hietko
Batavia Rd., Box 17
Warrenville, Ill.

Msgr. F. J. Dubosh, P.A.
12608 Madison Avenue
Lakewood 7, Ohio

President

Philip A. Hrobák
P. O. Box 150
Middletown, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

Rev. John W. Krišpinský
2425 W. 11th Street
Cleveland, Ohio

Julia Krajčovič
1648 W. 18th Street
Chicago 8, Ill.

Recording Secretary
Constantine Čulen
2900 East Boulevard
Cleveland 4, Ohio

Secretary-Treasurer
Milan V. Blažek
4922 S. Leclairre Avenue
Chicago 38, Ill.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Paul P. Jamriška
810 Montooth Street
Pittsburgh 10, Pa.

Joseph G. Pruša
205 Madison Street
Passaic, N. J.

Andrew J. Hamrock

61 Woodland Avenue
Campbell, Ohio

Stephen Dubiel

12210 Detroit Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio

Elizabeth Andrejko

551 Grove Avenue
Johnstown, Pa.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Michael J. Vargovič

National President
First Catholic Slovak Union

Helen Kočan

National President
First Catholic Slovak
Ladies Union

Paul Fallat

National President
Slovak Catholic Sokol

Stephen J. Tkach

National President
Penna. Slovak Union

Anna Soták

National President
Ladies Pennsylvania
Slovak Union

John Rozboril

National President
Slovak Catholic Cadet Union

SLOVAK NEWSPAPERS

(Affiliated with the Slovak League of America)

JEDNOTA

Middletown, Pa.

BRATSTVO

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

KATOLÍCKY SOKOL

Passaic, N. J.

SLOVENSKÁ OBRANA

Scranton, Pa.

SLOVENSKÉ NOVINY

Cleveland, Ohio

SVORNOST

Whitaker, Pa.

SLOVÁK V AMERIKE

Whiting, Ind.

ŽENSKÁ JEDNOTA

Cleveland, Ohio

ZORNIČKA

Chicago, Ill.

OSADNÉ HLASY

Chicago, Ill.

GANSER LIBRARY
MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE
MILLERSVILLE, PA. 17551



SLOVAKIA: General view of Bratislava, Capital of Slovakia, with the
Bratislava Castle in foreground